


PER BR 1 .P625 v.15

The Princeton theological
review



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

The Princeton Theological Review

OCTOBER, 1917

THE NINETY-FIVE THESES IN THEIR THEOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE

"A poor peasant's son, then a diligent student, an humble monk, and, finally, a modest, industrious scholar, Martin Luther had already exceeded the half of the life-time allotted to him, when—certainly with the decision characteristic of him, but with all the reserve imposed by his position in life and the immediate purpose of his action—he determined to subject the religious conceptions which lay at the basis of the indulgence-usages of the time to an examination in academic debate." This singularly comprehensive and equally singularly accurate statement of Paul Kalkoff's is worth quoting because it places us at once at the right point of view for forming an estimate of the Ninety-Five Theses which Luther, in prosecution of the purpose thus intimated, posted on the door of the Castle-Church at Wittenberg on the fateful October 31, 1517. It sets clearly before us the Luther who posted the Theses. It was—as he describes himself, indeed, in their heading—Martin Luther, Master of Arts and of Theology, Ordinary Professor of Theology in the University of Wittenberg. And it indicates to us with equal clearness the nature of the document which he posted. It consists of heads for a discussion designed to elucidate the truth with respect to the subject with which it deals—as again Luther himself tells us in its heading. We have to do here in a word with an academic document, prepared by an academic teacher, primarily for an academic purpose. All that the Theses were to become grows out of this fundamental fact. We have to reckon, of course, with the manner of man this Professor of Theology was; with the conception he held of the

function of the University in the social organism; with the zeal for the truth which consumed him. But in doing so we must not permit to fall out of sight that it is with a hard-working Professor of Theology, in the prosecution of his proper academical work that we have to do in these Theses. And above everything we must not forget the precise matter which the Theses bring into discussion; this was, as Kalkoff accurately describes it, the religious conceptions which lay at the basis of the indulgence-traffic.

Failure to bear these things fully in mind has resulted in much confusion. It is probably responsible for the absurd statement of A. Plummer to the effect that "Luther began with a mere protest against the sale of indulgences by disreputable persons." One would have thought a mere glance at the document would have rendered such an assertion impossible; although it is scarcely more absurd than Philip Schaff's remark that the Theses do "not protest against indulgences but only against their abuse"—which Plummer elaborates into: "Luther did not denounce the whole system of indulgences: he never disputed that the Church has power to remit the penalties which it has imposed in the form of penances to be performed in this world." To treat the whole system of indulgences, as proclaimed at the time, as an abuse of the ancient custom of relaxing, on due cause, imposed penances, is to attack the whole system with a vengeance.

The general lack of discernment with which the Theses have been read is nothing less than astonishing. It is not easy to understand, for instance, how T. M. Lindsay could have been led to say that they are "singularly unlike what might have been expected from a professional theologian". He instances a "lack of precise theological definition and of logical arrangement". He speaks of them as simply unordered sledge-hammer blows directed against an ecclesiastical abuse: as such utterances as were natural to a man in close touch with the people, who, shocked at the reports of what the pardon-sellers had said, wished to contradict

some of the statements which had been made in their defence. One does not know how Lindsay would expect a professional theologian to write. But certainly these Theses lack neither in profundity of theological insight nor in the strictest logical development of their theme. They constitute, in point of fact, a theological document of the first importance, working out a complete and closely knit argument against, not the abuses of the indulgence traffic, and not even the theory of indulgences, merely, but the whole sacerdotal conception of the saving process,—an outgrowth and embodiment of which indulgences were. The popular aspects of the matter are reserved to the end of the document, and are presented there, not for their own sake, but as ancillary arguments for the theological conclusion aimed at. E. Bratke is right in insisting on the distinctively theological character of the Theses: they were, he says truly, “a scientific attempt at a theological examination”; and Luther’s object in publishing them was a clearly positive one. “Not abuses,” says Bratke rightly, “nor the doctrine of penance, but the doctrine of the acquisition of salvation, it was, for which Luther seized his weapons in his own interests and in the interests of Christianity.”

Bernhard Bess may supply us, however, with our typical example of how the Theses should not be dealt with. He wishes to vindicate a Reformatory importance for them; but he has difficulty in discovering it. They do not look very important at first sight, he says. Everybody who reads them for the first time has a feeling of disappointment with them. Even theologians well acquainted with the theological language of the times have trouble in forming a clear notion of what they are about—what they deny, what they affirm. The few plain and distinct propositions as to the true penitence of a Christian and the forgiveness of sins, are buried beneath a mass of timid inquiries, of assertions scarcely made before they are half-recalled, of sentences which sound more like bon-mots than the well-weighed words of an academical teacher, of citations which

only too clearly betray themselves as mere padding. Everything is found here except the clear, thoroughly pondered and firmly grounded declarations of a man who knows what he is at. Naturally, in these circumstances, it has proved difficult for others to discover what Luther had it in mind here to say. A layman, on first reading these propositions, will understand little more than that the abuses with which the preaching of indulgences was accompanied, are here condemned. There have been learned theologians who have seen so little in them, that they have felt compelled to seek the motive for their publication outside of them. Catholics have found it in the jealousy of the Augustinian monk of the Dominican Tetzel; or in the fear that the indulgences offered by Tetzel should put out of countenance those connected with the Castle-Church at Wittenberg and its host of relics. Protestants have been driven back upon the notion that Luther is assaulting only the gross abuses of Tetzel's preaching—abuses which, however, better knowledge shows did not exist: Tetzel did not exceed his commission. Compelled to go behind Tetzel, A. W. Dieckhoff finds the ground of Luther's assault on indulgences in the rise of the doctrine of attrition by which all earnestness in repentance was destroyed and sin and salvation had come to be looked upon so lightly that moral seriousness was in danger of perishing out of the earth. Others, of whom Bess himself is one, call attention rather to the difference between indulgences in general and the Jubilee indulgences: the Jubilee indulgences alone are attacked by Luther—the Jubilee indulgences which had become a new sacrament, as John of Paltz declares, and a new sacrament of such power as to threaten to absorb into itself the whole saving function of the Church, and to substitute itself for the Gospel, for the cross.

We are moving here, no doubt, on the right track, but we are moving on too narrow-gauged a road, and we are not moving far enough. We must distinguish between the immediate occasion of Luther's protest and its real motive

and purport. The immediate occasion was, no doubt Tetzels preaching of the Jubilee indulgences in his neighborhood. But what Luther was led to do was to call in question, not merely the abuses which accompanied this particular instance of the proclamation of the Jubilee indulgences, or which were accustomed to accompany their proclamation; and not merely the peculiarities of the Jubilee indulgences among indulgences; and not even merely the whole theory of indulgences; but the entire prevalent theory of the relation of the Church as the institute of salvation to the salvation of souls. Thus the Theses become not merely an anti-indulgence proclamation but an anti-sacerdotal proclamation. And therein consists their importance as a Reformation act. Luther might have repelled all the abuses which had grown up about the preaching of indulgences and have remained a good Papalist. He might have rejected the Jubilee indulgences, *in toto*, and indeed the whole theory of indulgences as it had developed itself in the Church since the thirteenth century, and remained a good Catholic. But he hewed more closely to the line than that. He called in question the entire basis of the Catholic system and came forward in opposition to it, as an Evangelical.

That this could be the result of a series of Theses called out in opposition to the preaching of Jubilee indulgences is in part due to the very peculiarity of these indulgences. They included in themselves the sacrament of penance; and their rejection, not in circumstantial only but in principle, included in itself the repudiation of the conception of salvation of which the sacrament of penance was the crown. When Luther affirmed, in Theses 36 and 37, the culminating Theses of the whole series: "Every truly contrite Christian has plenary remission from punishment and guilt due to him, even without letters of pardon. Every true Christian, whether living or dead, has a share given to him by God in all the benefits of Christ and the Church, even without letters of pardon",—there is included in these

"letters of pardon", expressly declared unnecessary, the whole sacerdotal machinery of salvation; and Luther is asserting salvation apart from this machinery as normal salvation. Reducing the ecclesiastical part in salvation to a purely ministerial and declaratory one, he sets the sinful soul nakedly face to face with its God and throws it back immediately on His free mercy for its salvation.

The significance of the Theses as a Reformation act emerges thus in this: that they are a bold, an astonishingly bold, and a powerful, an astonishingly powerful, assertion of the evangelical doctrine of salvation, embodied in a searching, well-compacted, and thoroughly wrought-out refutation of the sacerdotal conception, as the underlying foundation on which the edifice of the indulgence-traffic was raised. This is what Walther Köhler means when he declares that we must recognize this as the fundamental idea of Luther's Theses: "the emancipation of the believer from the tutelage of the ecclesiastical institute"; and adds, "Thus God advances for him into the foreground; He alone is Lord of death and life; and to the Church falls the modest role of agent of God on earth—only there and nowhere else." "The most far-reaching consequences flowed from this", he continues: "Luther smote the Pope on his crown and simply obliterated his high pretensions with reference to the salvation of souls in this world and the next, and in their place set God and the soul in a personal communion which in its whole intercourse bears the stamp of interiority and spirituality." Julius Köstlin puts the whole matter with his accustomed clearness and balance—though with a little wider reference than the Theses themselves—when he describes the advance in Luther's testimony marked by the Indulgence controversy thus: "As he had up to this time proclaimed salvation in Christ through faith, in opposition to all human merit, so he now proclaims it in opposition to an external human ecclesiasticism and priesthood, whose acts are represented as conditioning the imparting of salvation itself and as in and of themselves, even without

faith, effecting salvation for those in whose interests they were performed."

How, in these circumstances, Philip Schaff can say of the Theses, "They were more Catholic than Protestant", passes comprehension. He does, no doubt, add on the next page, "The form only is Romish; the spirit and aim are Protestant"; but that is an inadequate correction. They are nothing less than, to speak negatively, an anti-sacerdotal, to speak positively, an evangelical manifesto. There are "remainders of Romanism" in them, to be sure, for Luther had not worked his way yet to the periphery of his system of thought. These "remainders of Romanism" led him in after years to speak of himself as at this time still involved in the great superstition of the Roman tyranny (1520), and even as a mad papist, so sunk in the Pope's dogmas that he was ready to murder any one who refused obedience to the Pope (1545). But these strong expressions witness rather to the horror with which he had come to look upon everything that was papist than do justice to the stage of his developing Protestantism which he had reached in 1517. The remainders of Romanism imbedded in the Theses are, after all, very few and very slight. Luther was not yet ready to reject indulgences in every sense. He still believed in a purgatory. He still had a great reverence for the organized Church; put a high value on the priestly function; and honored the Pope as the head of the ecclesiastical order. It is even possible to draw out from the Theses, indeed, some sentences which, in isolation, may appear startlingly Romish. We have in mind here such, for example, as the sixty-ninth, seventy-first and seventy-third. It is to be observed that these are consecutive odd numbers. That is because they are mere protases, preparing the way, each for a ringing apodosis in which the gravamen of the assertion lies.

Luther has reached the stage in his argument here where he has the crying abuses connected with the preaching of indulgences in view. He declares, to be sure, "It is incum-

bent on bishops and curates to receive the commissaries of the apostolical pardons with all reverence." But that is only that he may add with the more force: "But much more is it incumbent on them to see to it with all their eyes and to take heed to it with all their ears that these men do not preach their own dreams instead of the commission of the Pope." He proclaims, it is true, "He who speaks against the truth of apostolic pardons, let him be anathema and accursed." But that is only to give zest to the contrast: "But he who exerts himself against the wantonness and license of speech of the preacher of pardons, let him be blessed." If he allows that "the Pope justly fulminates against those who use any kind of machinations to the injury of the traffic in pardons", that is only that he may add: "Much more does he intend to fulminate against those who under pretext of pardons use machinations to the injury of holy charity and truth." If Luther seems in these statements to allow the validity of indulgences, that must be set down to the fault of his antithetical rhetoric rather than of his doctrine. These protases are really of the nature of rhetorical concessions, and are meant to serve only as hammers to drive home the contrary assertions of his apodoses. Luther has already reduced valid indulgences to the relaxation of ecclesiastical penances, and curbed the Pope's power with reference to the remission of sin to a purely declaratory function. "The Pope has neither the will nor the power to remit any penalties, except those which he has imposed by his own authority or by that of the Canons. The Pope has no power to remit any guilt except by declaring and approbating it to have been remitted by God." These two Theses cut up sacerdotalism by the roots.

We must be wary, too, lest we be misled by Luther's somewhat artificial use of his terms. He persistently means by "indulgences", "pardons", not the indulgences which actually existed in the world in which he lived—which he held to be gross corruptions of the only real indulgences—

but such indulgences as he was willing to admit to be valid, that is to say relaxations of ecclesiastically imposed penances; and he repeatedly speaks so as to imply that it is these which the Pope really intends—or at least in the judgment of charity ought to be assumed really to intend—by all the indulgences which he commissions. Even more persistently he means by “the Pope”, not the Pope as he actually was, but the Pope as he should be; that is to say, a “public person” representing and practically identical with the ecclesiastical Canons. Thus, when he declares in the ninety-second Thesis that “it is not the mind of the Pope that the buying of pardons is comparable to works of mercy”, he explains in his *Resolutions* (1518) that what he really means is that the Canons do not put the two on a par. “I understand the Pope,” he says, “as a public person, that is, as he speaks through the Canons: there are no Canons which declare that the value of indulgences is comparable to that of works of mercy.” At an earlier point he had said with great distinctness (on Thesis 26), “I am not in the least moved by what is pleasing or displeasing to the supreme Pontiff. He is a man like other men; there have been many supreme Pontiffs who were pleased not only with errors and vices but even with the most monstrous things. I hearken to the Pope as Pope; that is when he speaks in the Canons and speaks according to the Canons, or when he determines with a Council: but not when he speaks according to his own head—for I do not wish to be compelled to say, with some whose knowledge of Christ is defective, that the horrible deeds of blood committed by Julius II against the Christian people were the good deeds of a pious pastor done to Christ’s sheep.” The Pope to Luther was thus an administrative officer: not precisely what we should call a responsible ruler, but rather what we should speak of as a limited executive. The distinction he draws is not between the Pope speaking *ex cathedra* and in his own private capacity; it is rather between the Pope speaking of himself and according to his mandate. Only when the Pope spoke ac-

according to his mandate was he the Pope, and Luther repeatedly in the Theses ascribes to the "Pope" what he found in the Canons, and denies to the "Pope" what the actual Pope was saying and doing, because it was not in the Canons. To him the Pope was not so much authoritative as what was authoritative was "the Pope".

What Luther found it hardest to separate himself from in the Catholic system, was the authoritative ministration of the priest, God's representative, to weak and trembling souls. The strength and purity of the evangelicalism of the Theses is manifested in nothing more decisively than in their clear proclamation of the dependence of the soul for salvation on the mere grace of God alone. But Luther could not escape from the feeling that, in some way, the priest had an intermediating part to play in the application of this salvation. This feeling finds its expression particularly in Thesis 7: "God never remits guilt to anyone at all, except at the same time He subjects him, humbled in all things, to the priest, His vicar." In the exposition of this Thesis in the *Resolutions* he has much ado to discover an essential part in salvation for the priest to play. When the dust clears away, what he has to say is seen to reduce to this: "The remission of God, therefore, works grace, but the remission of the priest, peace." We may be saved without the priest, but we need his ministration to know that we are saved. The awakened sinner, by virtue of the very fact that he is awakened, cannot believe that he—even he—is forgiven, and needs the intermediation of God's representative, the priest, to assure him of it. The mischief is that Luther is inclined, if not to confuse, yet to join together these two things, and to treat salvation itself as therefore not quite accomplished until it is wrought *in foro conscientiae* as well as *in foro coeli*. "The remission of sin and the donation of grace is not enough," he says, "but there is necessary also the belief that it is remitted." It makes no difference to him, he says, whether you say that the priest is the *sine qua non* or any other kind of cause of the

remission of sin: all that he is exigent for is that it be allowed that in some way or other the priestly absolution is concerned in the remission of sin and guilt.

He will have, however, no *opus operatum*; and despite this magnifying of the part of absolution in salvation, he puts the priest firmly in his place, as a mere minister. It is after all not the priest, by virtue of any powers he may possess, but the man's own faith which in his absolution brings him remission. "For you will have only so much peace," he declares, "as you have faith in the words of Him who promised, 'whatsoever you loose, &c.' For our peace is Christ, but in faith. If anyone does not believe this word, he may be absolved a million times by the Pope himself, and confess to the whole world, and he will never come to rest." "Forgiveness depends not on the priest but on the word of Christ; the priest may be acting for the sake of gain or of honor—do you but seek without hypocrisy for forgiveness and believe Christ who has given you His promise, and even though it be of mere frivolity that he absolves you, you nevertheless will receive forgiveness from your faith . . . your faith receives it wholly. So great a thing is the word of Christ, and faith in it." "Accordingly it is through faith that we are justified, through faith also that we are brought to peace,—not through works, penances or confession." There is no lack even here, therefore, of the note of salvation by pure grace through faith alone. There is only an effort to place the actual experience of salvation in some real connection with the ministrations of the Church. And underlying this there is a tendency to confuse salvation itself with the assurance of it. Both these points of view lived on in the Lutheran churches.

The part played, in the line of thought just reviewed, by Luther's conception of evangelical repentance ought not to be passed over without notice. This conception is in a sense the ruling conception of the Theses. The Christian, according to Luther, is a repentant sinner, and by his very nature as a repentant sinner must suffer continuously the

pangs of repentance. By these pangs he is driven to mortifications of the flesh and becomes even greedy of suffering, which he recognizes as his appropriate life-element. So strong an emphasis does Luther place on suffering as a mark of the Christian life, indeed, that he has been sometimes represented as thinking of it as a good in itself, after the fashion of the mystics. Walther Köhler, for example, cries out, "The whole life a penance! Not only as often as the Church requires it in the confessional, no, the Christian's whole life is to be a great process of dying, 'mortification of the flesh',—up to the soul's leaving in death its bodily house. . . . The mystical warp is visible in this through and through personal religion." This, however, is a misconception. Luther is not dealing with men as men and with essential goods; he is speaking of sinners awakened to a knowledge of their sin, and of their necessary experience under the burden of their consciousness of guilt and pollution. He is giving us not his philosophy of life in the abstract, but his conception specifically of the Christian life. This, he says, is necessarily a life of penitent pain. In the fundamental opening Theses, he already points out that suffering, the suffering of rueful penitence, necessarily belongs to every sinner, so long as he remains a sinner—provided that he remains a repentant sinner. Without this compunction there is no remission of sin (36); with it there is no cessation in this life of suffering. The very process of salvation brings pain: no man, entering into life, can expect anything else for the outer man but "the cross, death, and hell" (58); nor does he seek to escape them, but he welcomes them rather as making for his peace (40, 29). And so, preaching "the piety of the cross" (68), Luther arrives at length at those amazing closing Theses in which, invoking a curse on those who cry, Peace, peace! when there is no peace, and pronouncing a blessing on those who call out, "The cross, the cross!"—though it is no real cross to the children of God—he declares that Christians must strive to follow Christ, their Head, through pains, deaths, and hells,

and only thus to enter heaven through many tribulations,—rather than, he adds, striking at the indulgence-usages, “through the security of peace”. There is a note of *imitatio Christi* here, of course; but not in the mystical sense. Rather there speaks here a deep conviction that the Christian life is a battle, a struggle, a strenuous work; and a great cry of outrage at the whole tendency of the indulgence system to ungird the loins, and call men off from the conflict, lulling their consciences into a fatal sleep. Luther is not dreaming here of the purchase of heaven by human suffering or works. He has a Christian man in mind. He is speaking of the path over which one treads, who, in his new life, is journeying to his final bliss. Clearly he does not expect to “lie down” on the grace that saves him. He looks at the Christian life as a life of strenuous moral effort. His brand of “passive” salvation is all activity.

Its lack of moral earnestness was to earnest minds the crowning offence of the system of indulgences. In the midst of a system of work-salvation it had grown up as an expedient by means of which the work might be escaped and the salvation nevertheless secured. The “works” could not, to be sure, be altogether escaped: there must be something to take their place and represent them. That much the underlying idea of work-salvation demanded. That something was money. The experience of young Friedrich Mecum (we know him as Myconius) may instruct us here. As a youth of eighteen he heard Tetzel preach the indulgences in 1510 at Annaberg. He was deeply moved with desire to save his soul. He had no money, but had he not read, posted on the church door, that it was the wish of the holy Father that from now on the indulgences should be sold for a low price and even indeed given gratis to those unable to purchase them? He presented himself at Tetzel’s dwelling to make his plea. The high commissary himself he could not see; but the Priests and Confessors in the ante-chamber pointed out to him that indulgences could not be given, and if given would be worthless. They would bene-

fit only those who stretched out a helping hand. Let him go out and beg from some pious person only so much as a groschen, or six pfennigs—and he could purchase one for that. This was not mere heartlessness. It was intrinsic to the system. An indulgence was a relaxation of penance, and penance was payment: provision might be made for less payment but not for no payment at all. At the bottom of all lies the fundamental notion that salvation must be paid for: it is only a question of the price. Indulgences thus emerge to sight as a scheme to evade one's spiritual and moral debts and to secure eternal felicity at the least possible cost.

We need not insist here on the peculiarities of the Jubilee indulgences with which Luther was most immediately concerned, and the characteristic feature of which was that it included the sacrament of penance within itself. All indulgences in their developed form made a part of the sacerdotal system and worked in with the sacrament of penance: they were not offered to the heathen but to Christians, to men, that is, who had been baptized and had access to the ordinary ghostly ministrations. The fundamental idea embedded in them—of which they are, indeed, the culminating illustration—is that the offices of the Church may be called in not merely to supplement but to take the place of the duties of personal religion and common morality: they thus put the capstone on sacerdotal religiosity. It may be a coarse way of putting it, to say that in this system a man might buy his way into heaven; that he might purchase immunity for sin; that he might even barter for license to sin. But with whatever finessing the direct statement may be avoided, both in theory and practice it amounts to that. Baptism, penance, indulgence—these three provisions taken together provide a method by which a man, through the offices of the church, might escape every evil consequence of his sin, inborn and self-committed; and by the expenditure of only a little ceremonial care and a little money, assure himself of unmerited salvation. He who is baptized

is brought into a state of grace and through penance may maintain himself in grace—and, in the interests at once of the comfort of weak souls and of the power of the Church, the efficacy of penance is exalted, despite the defects of contrition and the substitution for it of mere attrition. Relieved by these offices of the eternal penalties of their sin, indulgences now come in to relieve men of their temporal penalties. Both the eternal and the temporal penalties being gone, guilt need not be bothered with: hell and purgatory having both been abolished, guilt will take care of itself. Thus a baptized man—and all within the pale of the Church are baptized,—by shriving himself, say, every Easter and buying an indulgence or two, makes himself safe. The Church takes care of him throughout, and it costs him nothing but an annual confession and the few coins that rattle in the collection box. Adolf Harnack sums up the matter thus: “Every man who surrenders himself to the Catholic Church . . . can secure salvation from all eternal and temporal penalties—if he act with shrewdness and find a skilful priest.”

It was one of the attractions of the indulgences which Tetzel hawked about that they gave the purchaser the right to choose a confessor for himself and required this confessor to absolve him. They thus made his immunity from all punishment sure. Marvellous to say, the vendors of indulgences were not satisfied with thus selling the justice of heaven; they wished to sell the justice of earth, too. Luther, it is true, in a passage in his *Resolutions* denies that “the Pope” “remits civil or rather criminal penalties, inflicted by the civil law”, but he adds that “the legates do do this in some places when they are personally present”; and in another place he betrays why he wishes to shield “the Pope” from the onus of this iniquity, saying that “the Pope” cannot be supposed to have the power to remit civil penalties, because in that case “the letters of indulgence will abolish all gibbets and racks throughout the world”—that is to say, would do away altogether with the punishment of

crime. In point of fact the actual as distinguished from Luther's ideal Pope did issue indulgences embodying this precise provision, and those sold by Tetzel were among them. Henry Charles Lea remarks upon them thus: The power to protect from all secular courts "was delegated to the peripatetic vendors of indulgences, who thus carried impunity for crime to every man's door. The St. Peter's indulgences, sold by Tetzel and his colleagues were of this character, and not only released the purchaser from all spiritual penalties but forbade all secular and criminal prosecution. . . . It was fortunate that the Reformation came to prevent the Holy See from rendering all justice, human and divine, a commodity to be sold in the open market."

It is very instructive to observe the superficial resemblance between the language in which the indulgences were commended and that of the evangelical proclamation. Both offered a salvation that the recipient had not earned by his works, but was to receive from the immense mercy of God. "We have been conceived in sin,"—Tetzel's preaching is thus summarized by Julius Köstlin,—“and are wrapped in bonds of sin. It is hard—yes, impossible—to attain salvation without divine help. Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but by His mercy, God has saved us. Therefore, put on the armor of God.” The attractiveness of indulgences arose from this very thing,—that they offered to men relief from the dread of anticipated punishment and reception into bliss, on grounds less onerous than the “works or righteousness” or “merit-making” involved in the ordinary church system. To the superficial view this could be given very much the appearance of Luther's doctrine of justification by faith. In both the pure mercy of God to lost and helpless sinners could be pointed to as the source of the salvation offered. In both the merits of Christ could be pointed to as the ground of the acceptance of the sinner. The Romanists included in their “Treasure” also, it is true, the merits of the saints, and Luther therefore couples the two in Thesis 58, although telling us in his

Resolutions that the saints have no merits to offer, and if they had they would do us no good. It does not go deeply enough to say that the difference between the two proclamations lies in this—that Luther demands for this free salvation faith alone, while Tetzels proposes to hand it over for money down—in accordance with the quip attributed to Cardinal Borgia, that God desires not the death of sinners, but that they shall pay and live. The fundamental difference between the two doctrines is the fundamental difference between evangelicalism and sacerdotalism. Evangelicalism casts man back on God and God only; the faith that it asks of him is faith in God's saving grace in Christ alone. Sacerdotalism throws him into the hands of the Church and asks him to put his confidence in it—or, in the indulgences, very specifically in the Pope. He is to suspend his salvation on what the Pope can do—whether directly by his own power or in the way of suffrage—transferring to his credit the merits of Christ and His saints. This difference is correlated with this further one, that the release offered in the indulgences was from penalty, that sought in evangelicalism very distinctly from guilt. Transposed into positive language, that means that in the one case desire for comfort and happiness holds the mind, in the other a yearning for holiness. The one is non-ethical and must needs bear its fruits as such. The other tingles with ethicism to the finger tips. The mind, freed by its high enthusiasm from debilitating fear of suffering, is fired to unceasing endeavor by a great ambition to be well-pleasing to God. The gulf which separated Luther and the proclamation of indulgences and compelled him to appear in opposition to it was therefore radical and goes down to the roots of the contradictory systems of doctrine. It was not the abuses which accompanied this proclamation which moved him, though they shocked him profoundly. It was indeed not the indulgences themselves, but what lay behind and beneath the indulgences. J. Janssen is perfectly right, then, when speaking of the abuses of the traffic, he writes: "It was not, however, espe-

cially these abuses which occasioned Luther to his procedure against indulgences, but the doctrine of indulgences itself, particularly the church doctrine of good works which was contrary to his conceptions about justification and the bondage of the human will."

The Roman Curia had no difficulty in perceiving precisely where Luther's blow fell. The lighter forces rushed, of course, to the defence of the peripheral things: the papal authority, the legitimacy of indulgences. The result was that, as Luther says in the opening words of *The Babylonish Captivity*, they served as teachers for him and opened his eyes to matters on which he had not perfectly informed himself before. He had preserved reverence for the Pope as head of the Church. They taught him to look upon him as Antichrist. He had not wished totally to reject indulgences. "By the kind aid of Sylvester and the Friars", he now learned that they could properly be described only as "the mere impostures of Roman flatterers, by which they took away both faith in God and men's money". In his *Assertio* of the Articles condemned by Leo's Bull, written in the same year (1520), he, with mock humility, retracts his statement, objected to, to the effect that indulgences were pious frauds of believers—a statement apparently borrowed from Albert of Mainz who calls them pious frauds by which the Church allured believers to pious works—and now asserts that they are just impious frauds and impostures of wicked popes. But the Curia in its immediate action went deeper than these things. When Luther appeared before Cardinal Cajetan in October, 1518, the representative of the Pope laid his finger on just two propositions which he required him absolutely to recant. These were the assertion in the fifty-eighth Thesis that the merits of Christ work effectually without the intervention of the Pope and therefore cannot be the "Treasure" drawn upon by the indulgences; and an assertion in the *Resolutions* on the seventh Thesis to the effect that the sacraments do not work effectively unless received by faith. Obviously in these two

propositions is embodied the essence of evangelicalism: salvation the immediate gift of Christ; faith and faith alone the real instrument of reception of grace.

Cajetan's entire dealing with Luther consisted in insistence on his recanting just these two assertions. Luther gives a very amusing account of an undignified scene in which Cajetan pressed him to recant the fifty-eighth Thesis, on the basis of an Extravagant of Clement VI's. He would listen to no explanations, but simply demanded continuously, pointing at the Extravagant, "Do you believe that or do you not?" At last, says Luther, the Legate tried to beat him down with an interminable speech drawn from "the fables" of St. Thomas, into which Luther a half a score of times attempted in vain to break. "Finally," he proceeds in his description, "I too began to shriek, and said, 'If it can be shown that that Extravagant teaches that the merits of Christ are the treasure of indulgences, I will recant, according to your wish.' Great God, into what triumphant gestures and scornful laughter he now broke out! He seized the book suddenly and read furiously and snarlingly until he came to the place where it says that Christ purchased a treasure by His suffering, &c. Here I said, 'Listen, reverend Father, note well the words—"He purchased". If Christ purchased the treasure by His merits, it follows that the treasure is not the merits, but that which the merits have purchased—that is the keys of the Church. Therefore my thesis is true.' Here he became suddenly confused; and since he did not wish to appear confused he jumped violently to other subjects and sought to have this forgotten. But I was (not very respectfully, I confess) incensed, and broke out thus: 'Reverend Father, you must not think that Germans are ignorant of grammar also;—"to be a treasure", and "to purchase" are different things.'"

We must confess that Luther escaped by the skin of his teeth that time. Fortunately he had better reasons for contending that the Scriptures do not teach the doctrine in question than that Clement and Sixtus do not. In his written

answer to Cajetan he deals with the matter more seriously. He argues the question even there, however, with the understanding that his business is to show that his Thesis is not in disharmony with the Papal teaching; and he not very safely promises to adopt as his own whatever the Pope may declare to be true, a promise which two years afterwards he could not have repeated. On the real evangelical core of the Thesis, however,—that the merits of Christ work grace independently of the Pope,—and on the second proposition which he was required to recant,—that the sacraments are without effect in the absence of faith—he was absolutely unbending. He throws his assertion concerning faith, moreover, into such a form as to make it include assurance,—a matter of some interest in view of the presence of a phrase or two in the Theses and in the letter to Albert of Mainz enclosing a copy of them to him, which might be incautiously read as denying the possibility of assurance, but which really mean only to deny that assurance can be derived from anything whatever except Christ alone. What he declares to Cajetan to be “absolutely true”, is “that no man can be just before God except alone through faith”; and therefore, he adds, “it is necessary that a man certainly believe that he is just and not doubt that he receives grace. For if he doubt it, and is uncertain of it,” he argues, “then he is not just but opposes grace and casts it away from him.”

What Luther is eager to do is, not to leave men in uncertainty as to their salvation, but to protect them from placing their trust in anything but Christ—certainly not in letters of pardon (Thesis 32: “Those who believe that through letters of pardon they are made sure of their own salvation, will be eternally damned along with their teachers”), or in the assurances of any man whatever, no matter what his assumed spiritual authority may be (Thesis 52: “Vain is the hope of salvation through letters of pardon, even if a commissary—nay, the Pope himself—were to pledge his soul for them”): but just as certainly not in their own contrition (Thesis 30: “No man is sure of the reality of his

own contrition, much less of the attainment of plenary remission",—a thesis which Luther declares in the *Resolutions* not to be true in his sense but only in that of his opponents). "May all such teaching as would persuade to security and confidence (*securitatem et fiduciam*) in or through anything whatever except the mercy of God, which is Christ, be accursed", he cries out in the *Resolutions* when speaking of Thesis 52. "Beware of confiding in thy contrition", he says when commenting on Thesis 36—and the comment is needed, lest the unwary reader might suppose that Thesis to counsel this very thing—"or of attributing the remission of sins to thy sorrow. God does not look with favor on thee because of these things, but because of thy faith with which thou hast believed his threatenings and promises and which has wrought such sorrow." "Guard thyself, then," he says again (on Thesis 38), "against ever in any wise trusting in thy contrition, but only in the mere word of thy best and most faithful Savior, Jesus Christ: thy heart can deceive thee, He cannot deceive thee—whether thou dost possess Him or dost desire Him."

How pure the evangelicalism here expressed is may be perceived by reading only a few lines of the positive comment on the great central Theses 36, 37. "It is impossible that one should be a Christian without Christ; but if anyone has Christ, he has with Him all that is Christ's. For the holy apostle speaks thus— . . . Rom. 8: 32: 'How shall he not with Him also give us all things.' " "For this is the confidence of Christians, and the joy of our consciences, that by faith our sins become not ours but Christ's, on whom God has put our sins and He has borne our sins,—He who is the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. And again all Christ's righteousness is ours. For He lays His hands upon us and it is well with us; and He spreads His robe over us and covers us—the blessed Savior for ever, Amen!" "But since this sweetest participation and joyful interchange does not take place except by faith—and man cannot give and cannot take away this faith—I think it

sufficiently clear that this participation is not given by the power of the keys, or by the benefit of letters of indulgence, but rather is given before and apart from them by God alone; as remission before remission, and absolution before absolution, so participation before participation. What participation then does the Pope give in his participation? I answer: They ought to say as was said above of remission in Thesis 6, that he gives participation declaratively. For how they can say anything else I confess I do not understand." "Why then do they magnify the Pontiff because of the keys and think of him as a terrible being? The keys are not his, but rather mine, given to me for my salvation, for my consolation, granted for my peace and quiet. In the keys the Pontiff is my servant and minister; he has no need of them as a Pontiff, but I." Through all it is faith that is celebrated. "You have as much as you believe." The sacraments are efficacious not because they are enacted, but because they are believed. Absolution is effective not because it is given, but because it is believed. Only—the penitent believer needs the authoritative priestly word that he may believe that he—even he—can really be sharer in these great things. "Therefore it is neither the sacrament, nor the priest, but faith in the word of Christ, through the priest and his office, that justifies thee. What difference does it make to thee if the Lord speak through an ass or a jenny, if only thou dost hear His word, on which thou dost stay thy hope and rest thy faith?"

It is not, however, only in a sentence here and there that the evangelical note is sounded in the Theses. What requires to be insisted upon is that they constitute in their entirety a compact and well-ordered presentation of the evangelical position in opposition to sacerdotalism. This presentation was called out by the preaching of indulgences and takes its form from its primary reference to them. But what it strikes particularly at is the sacerdotal roots of indulgences, and what it sets in opposition to them is the pure evangelical principle. It must not be imagined that

these Theses were hastily prepared merely to meet a sudden emergency created by Tetzels preaching at Jüterbog. Luther had preached on indulgences on the same day, October 31, of the preceding year, and in the midsummer (July 27) before that. And—this is the point to take especial note of—the Theses repeat the thought and much of the language of these sermons. They are therefore the deliberate expression of long-meditated and thoroughly matured thought; in substance and language alike they had been fully in mind for a year and more. The *Resolutions*, published the next year—and manifesting next to no advance in opinion on the Theses which they expound—show that Luther was thoroughly informed on the whole subject and had its entire literature at easy command. His choice of October 31, the eve of All Saints' Day, for posting the Theses, has also its very distinct significance. This choice was determined by something more than a desire to gain for them the publicity which that day provided. All Saints' Day was not merely the anniversary of the consecration of the church, elaborate services on which were attended by thousands. It was also the day on which the great collection of relics accumulated by the Elector was exhibited; and to the veneration of them and attendance on the day's services special indulgences were attached. It was, in a word, Indulgence Day at Wittenberg; and that was the attraction which brought the crowds thither on it. Luther, we have just pointed out, had preached a sermon against indulgences on the preceding October 31. On this October 31 he posts his Theses. The coincidence is not accidental. The Theses came not at the beginning but in the middle of his attack on indulgences, and have in view, not Tetzels and his Jubilee indulgences alone, but the whole indulgence system. That the preaching in Germany of the Jubilee indulgences was the occasion of Luther's coming forward in this attack on indulgences, he tells us himself. He explains somewhat objectively how he was drawn into it when writing to his ecclesiastical superior: "I was asked

by many strangers as well as friends, both by letter and by word of mouth, for my opinion of these new not to say licentious teachings; for a while I held out—but in the end their complaints became so bitter as to endanger reverence for the Pope.” Similarly he declares in the *Resolutions*: “I have been compelled to lay down all these positions because I saw that some were infected with false opinions, and others were laughing in the taverns and holding up the holy priesthood to open ridicule, because of the great license with which the indulgences are preached.” This is not to say, however, that in meeting this call upon him, Luther was not moved by a deeper-lying motive and did not wish to go to the bottom of the matter. When writing privately to his friends he did not hesitate to say as early as the middle of February 1518, that “indulgences now seem to me to be nothing but a snare for souls and worth absolutely nothing except to those who slumber and idle in the way of Christ”, and to explain his coming forward against them thus: “For the sake of opposing this fraud, for the love of truth, I entered this dangerous labyrinth of disputation.”

The document itself however is the best witness to the care given to its preparation and to the depth of its purpose as an anti-sacerdotal manifesto. There are no signs of haste about it, and, in point of fact, the question is argued in it from the point of sight of fundamental principles. In its opening propositions, Luther begins by laying down in firm lines the Christian doctrine of penitence. It is, he says, of course the very mark of the penitent sinner that he is penitent; and of course he can never cease to be penitent so long as he is, what as a Christian he must be.—a penitent sinner. His penitence is not only fundamentally an interior fact: but if it is real, it manifests itself in outward mortifications. This being what a Christian man essentially is, what now has the Pope to do with the penalties which he suffers—which constitute the very substance and manifestation of the penitence by virtue of which he is a penitent as distinguished from an impenitent sinner?

Luther's answer is, Nothing whatever. With reference to the living he declares that the Pope can relieve a man only of penalties of his own imposing; with respect to penalties of God's imposing he has only a declarative function. With reference to the dying, why, by the very act of dying they escape out of the Pope's hands. There is, of course, purgatory. But purgatory is not a place where old scores are paid off; but a place where imperfect souls are perfected in holiness; and surely the Pope neither can nor would wish to intermit their perfecting. Clearly, then, it is futile to trust in indulgences. There is nothing for them to do. They cannot release us from the necessity of being Christians; and if we are Christians, we can have no manner of need of them. In asserting this, Luther closes this first and principal part of the document—constituting one third of the whole—with the great evangelical declarations: "Every truly contrite Christian has of right plenary remission of penalty and guilt—even without letters of pardon. Every true Christian, whether living or dead, has given to him by God, a share in all the benefits of Christ and the Church—even without letters of pardon."

Having thus laid down the general principles, Luther now takes a new start and points out some of the dangers which accompany the preaching of indulgences. There is the danger that the purchase of indulgences should be made to appear more important than the exercise of charity, or even than the maintenance of our dependents. There is the danger that the head of the Church may be made to appear more desirous of the people's money than of their prayers. There is the danger that the preaching of indulgences may encroach upon or even supersede the preaching of the Gospel in the churches. After all, the preaching of the Gospel is the main thing. It is the true treasure of the Church: indeed, it is the only treasure on which the Church can draw. The section closes with some pointed antitheses, contrasting the indulgences and the Gospel: the indulgences which make the last to be first and seek after men's riches, and the Gos-

pel which makes the first to be last and seeks after those men who are rich indeed: indulgences are gainful things no doubt, but grace and the piety of the cross—they belong to the Gospel.

A third start is now taken, and Luther sharply arraigns the actual misdeeds of the preachers of pardons and their unmeasured assertions (*licentiosa pradicatio*). Of course the commissaries of the apostolical pardons are not to be excluded from dioceses and parishes: they come with the Pope's commission and the Pope is the head of the Church. But bishops and curates are bound to see to it that the unbridled license of their preaching is curbed within the just limits of their commission. As it is, they have filled the world with murmurings and it is not easy to defend the Pope against the sharp questions which the people are asking. Luther adduces eight of these questions as specimens: they constitute a tremendous indictment against the whole indulgence traffic from the point of view of practical common sense, and are all the more effective because repeated out of the mouth of the people. They are such as these:—If the Pope has the power to release souls from purgatory, why does he not, out of his mere charity, release the whole lot of them, and not dole their release out one by one for money? If souls are released from purgatory by indulgences, why does the Pope keep the endowments for masses for these same souls, after they have been released? Why should the money of a wicked man move the Pope to release a soul from purgatory more than that soul's own deep need? Why does the Pope treat dead Canons as still alive and take money for relaxing them? Why does the rich Pope not build St. Peter's out of his own superfluity and not tax the poor for it? What is it, after all, that the Pope remits to those whose perfect contrition has already gained their remission? What is the effect of accumulating indulgences? If it is the salvation of souls and not money that the Pope is after, why does he suspend old letters of pardon and put new ones on sale? Such searching arguments as these,

Luther justly says, cannot be met by a display of force: they must be answered.

Then he brings the whole document to a close with some fervent words renouncing a gospel of ease, crying Peace, peace! such as the indulgences offer: and proclaiming the strenuous gospel of the cross: "Christians should be exhorted to strive to follow their Head, Christ, through pains and deaths and hells, and thus to trust to enter heaven rather through many tribulations than through the security of peace."

It belongs to the general structure of the document,—advancing as it does from the principles which underlie the indulgence traffic, through the dangers which accompany it, to its actual abuses—that its tone should grow sharper and its attack more direct with its progress. Luther's argumentative purpose and his rhetorical instinct have no doubt co-operated to produce this result. It suited the end he had in view to present the indulgences as a species under a broader genus. But also it pleased his rhetorical sense so to manage his material as to have it grow in force and directness of assertion steadily to the end, and to close in what deserves the name of a fervent peroration. The calm, detached propositions of the first section pass in the second into a series of rhetorical repetitions, and these give way as the third section is approached to stinging antitheses. Nevertheless the real weight of the document lies in its first section, and it is by virtue of the propositions laid down there that it is worthy of its place as the first great Reformation act, and the day of its posting is justly looked upon as the birthday of the Reformation.

The posting of these Theses does not mark the acquisition by Luther of his evangelical convictions. These had long been his—how long we hardly know but must content ourselves with saying, with Walther Köhler, that they were apparently acquired somewhere between 1509 and 1515. Neither does their posting mark the beginning of the evangelical proclamation. From at least 1515 Luther had been

diligently propagating his evangelicalism in pulpit and chair, and had already fairly converted his immediate community to it. He could already boast of the victory of "our theology" in the university, and the town was in his hands. What is marked by the posting of these Theses is the issuing of the Reformation out of the narrow confines of the university circles of Wittenberg and its start on its career as a world-movement. Their posting gave wings to the Reformation. And it gave it wings primarily by rallying to its aid the smouldering sense of outrage which had long been gathering against a gross ecclesiastical abuse. This would not have carried it far, however, had not the document in which it was thus sent abroad had in it the potency of the new life.

"What is epoch-making in the theses," writes E. Bratke, "is that they are the first public proclamation in which Luther in full consciousness made the truth of justifying faith as the sole principle of the communication of salvation, the theme of a theological controversy, and thus laid before the church a problem for further research, which afterwards became the motive and principle of a new development of the Christian Church, yes, of civilization in general." What Bratke is trying to say here is true; and, being true, is vastly important. But he does not say it well. Luther had often before proclaimed the principle of justifying faith in full enthusiasm, to as wide a public as his voice could reach. It happens that neither faith nor justification is once mentioned in the Theses. It is the Lectures on Romans of 1515-1516 that the epoch-making exposition of justification by faith was made, not in the Theses. Nevertheless, it is true that the Theses are the express outcome of Luther's new "life principle", and have as their fundamental purpose to set it in opposition to "human ecclesiasticism and sacerdotalism". And it is true that the idea of justification by faith underlies them throughout and only does not come to explicit expression in them because the occasion does not call for that: Luther cannot expound them (as in the *Resolu-*

tions) without dwelling largely on it. The matter would be better expressed, however, by saying that Luther here sets the evangelical principle flatly in opposition to the sacerdotal. What he here attacks is just the sacerdotal principle in one of its most portentous embodiments—the teaching that men are to look to the Church as the institute of salvation for all their souls' welfare, and to derive from the Church all their confidence in life and in death. What he sets over against this sacerdotalism is the evangelical principle that man is dependent for his salvation on God and on God alone—on God directly, apart from all human intermeditation—and is to look to God for and to derive from God immediately all that makes for his soul's welfare. In these Theses Luther brought out of the academic circle in which he had hitherto moved, and cast into the arena of the wide world's conflicts, under circumstances which attracted and held the attention of men, his newly found evangelical principle, thrown out into sharp contrast with the established sacerdotalism. It is this that made the posting of these Theses the first act of the Reformation, and has rightly made October Thirty-first the birthday of the Reformation.

Princeton.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

MARTIN LUTHER AND JOHN CALVIN, CHURCH REFORMERS

So far as I am aware, no one has proposed the honors of canonization for any of the Protestant Reformers. Such honors have been freely assigned to many who lived in ages when correct biography was not in vogue. Even so good a man as Bernard of Clairvaux, to whom we easily accord the name "saint," had his appreciable faults. The age in which Luther and Calvin lived was the age of print and the reporter took down everything men of eminence did or said and the writing of biographies was not confined to admirers as in the Middle Ages. These men had their blemishes,—serious blemishes. They were of like passions with ourselves. We know too much about them, we are quite willing to acknowledge, to invest their foreheads with the aureole.

We pay them honor for their service to religion and society just as in the sphere of discovery, we pay honor to the greater navigators in these Western regions, Columbus and Magellan. Luther and Calvin opened the door to the modern era of history. Not Charles V or Henry VIII, not Erasmus and Reuchlin, not Shakespeare and Bacon but Luther and Calvin enunciated the interpretations along which religious thought and social liberties in Protestant countries have been advancing.

In intellectual gifts and disposition most unlike, they were fully coöperant in the work of the Reformation. It must be recalled, however, that Calvin was only an infant when Luther was a doctor of theology. When the Theses were posted up, Calvin was but eight years old and when the Diet of Worms met he was still a school lad. All the spiritual principles of the Reformation were announced a considerable time before Calvin was through with his university studies.

In the history of the Church since the days of the Apostles I can think of only two figures of marked preeminence,

contemporary the one with the other, with whom the great Reformers of the 16th century may be compared, Francis d'Assisi and Dominic of Guzman. These two remarkable men of the 13th century, the one an Italian, the other a Spaniard, also differed widely in gifts, disposition and training and yet were united in a compelling religious purpose of a reformatory kind and, acting independently the one of the other, started and furthered one of the most notable religious revivals since the days of St. Paul. The methods of the gentle Francis and the proud disciplinarian were as different as their temperaments. Their precepts and example put new life into the missionary and social activities of the Church. A century after their deaths Dante joined them in one of the highest celestial spheres, the one as an Ardor inflaming the world with love, the other as a Splendor filling it with light. Their followers were quickly found in every part of Europe and gained renown on the mission field. They occupied the seats in the universities. Thomas Aquinas and Savonarola were Dominicans: Bonaventura, Duns Scotus and Ockam Franciscans.

Not a hundred years elapsed, however, until the name "friar" was synonymous with laziness, ignorance and superstition so far had the testaments and careers of Francis and Dominic been forgotten. In this we have another parallel between them on the one hand and the two leaders of the Protestant Reformation on the other. The followers of Luther and Calvin in the generations immediately succeeding their deaths carried on one against the other and each party to some extent within its own membership what we are inclined to pronounce fierce and un-Christian polemics and strife.

1. In the circumstances of birth and the preparation for their work Luther and Calvin differed widely. Like the great commoner in our national history, Luther came—to use the common phrase—from the humbler class. Like another in our national history, the father of his country, Calvin came from the educated and polished class. It was

one of Luther's noblest traits that he never sought to hide the lowly environment in which he was born. Eminence did not puff him up. He never affected the company of the mighty or courted the patronage of princes. "I am the son of a peasant," he used to say, "my father and grandfather and all my ancestors were genuine peasants."

John Calvin was born in France under the eaves of the episcopal palace of Noyon. His father was a man of ecclesiastical position. To the son the path to school and university was wide open and his support assured by church patronage bestowed upon him when he was still a child.

Both chose a legal career. According to Melanchthon, Luther's talents were the admiration of his university, Erfurt. Calvin's gifts won tribute from his distinguished professors. Both, as students, had demonstrated that they were endowed with intellectual gifts of a high order.

Luther's studies in the law were suddenly checked by two occurrences which startled his conscience. He bade farewell to the world, its honors and pleasures and, against the will of his father, took the path which for centuries had been praised, as by Anselm and St. Bernard, as the safest way to holiness and heaven. The life in the Augustinian convent was of unspeakable advantage to the future Reformer. He was faithful to its rules and subjected himself to physical mortifications in order to get peace with God as also to a severe study of theology that he might get wisdom. In later years, when he wrote and spoke, he wrote and spoke as one who knew what monkery was. So evident was his conventual devotion that his superiors pointed him out as the model monk and so well esteemed was he for his parts that he was raised to the position of district-vicar of his order and appointed at an early age to a professorship. His visit to Rome in an official capacity was likewise a factor of much importance in his preparation. He saw religion in practice in the capitol of Christendom, he said masses at its altars, he kneeled up the *scala sancta*, at every step saying a prayer that his grandfather might be

released from purgatory. His promise and his worth were recognized by the friendship of John of Staupitz. Before he was thirty, he was invested with the doctorate of divinity, a rank of which he was always proud.

His strenuous application as a student and young professor attested by the voluminous manuscripts from his pen recently discovered, is again and again freely acknowledged by the Roman Catholic scholar Grisar in his recent elaborate and learned biography of the Reformer. In 1521 Cochlaeus, his detractor, saw him at Worms and wrote "Cares and studies have made him so thin, that one may count all the bones in his body." Luther favored the new study of the classics, corresponded with Erasmus and defended Reuchlin but he was never a Humanist in the sense of devoting himself by preference to classical culture. To him theology, was, as he said, "the kernel of the nut, the marrow in the bones, the flour of the wheat" and he was overjoyed when the time came for him to pass from the teaching of philosophy and logic to the presentation of theological themes.

As lecturer of theology in Wittenberg he entered upon a careful study of Augustine, a study neglected even within the Augustinian order. For his religious development, as later for Calvin in the system that theologian presented, this study of the African father was of first import. But more—through Luther the study of Augustine became popular at Wittenberg. Through his influence also a new era in the curriculum of the university seemed about to dawn. This man, wrote Dr. Martin Pollich, rector of the Wittenberg school "will puzzle all our doctors and bring in the new teaching and reform the whole Roman church, for he takes his stand on the writings of the Apostles and Prophets and on the word of Jesus Christ." Along this path of Biblical study, Augustine had been his chief human helper.

In the case of Calvin, the religious element does not distinctly attract during the progress of his university studies. He was a brilliant student of the law and a promising adept

of humanistic culture. His first publication was an edition of one of Seneca's works, in which he mingled quotations from Scripture with quotations taken from classic authors. Before his adoption of the new views he had trained no students in theology: he had prepared no lectures on the biblical books: he had had no monastic experience. On the other hand, his legal training and his humanistic studies had developed in his fine intellect a remarkable precision of thought and furnished him with a Latin style which is pronounced to be of high purity.

In two matters of prime importance for their preparation as religious leaders, Luther and Calvin were agreed. They were up to date men in their studies. They were acquainted with Greek and Hebrew,—studies which were pronounced by a widespread opinion dangerous if not heretical. They might have been called "higher critics" had that expression been in vogue four centuries ago. Luther studied Hebrew and Greek for the very purpose of finding out the meaning of Scripture and Calvin, after "his conversion," took up the study of Hebrew at Basel for the same purpose. For a thousand years no Western churchman had known Greek and Hebrew. Gregory the Great knew no Greek, Anselm knew no Greek, Thomas Aquinas knew no Greek, Wyclif knew no Greek. But Luther did and Calvin did. And, when Eck and Prierias and other controversialists were defending the old system with citations from the canon law and church precedent, Luther was literally filling his pages with quotations from the Scriptures and in cases, references to their original meaning.

The other matter of prime importance in which they were agreed was that both were subjects of a startling and determining religious experience. Their change of views was the result of a severe study of Scripture, at least in Luther's case, and also, as it were, the result of a sudden revelation. The Reformation was an experience in their souls before it became a historic movement. The new era dawned in them before it was proclaimed from pulpit and in

tract. Luther's experience has been compared to the vision seen by St. Paul. No influence from outside started him on his career. No Wyclif or Huss or Marsiglius of Padua stirred his heart. No group of Humanists, no progressive party among the monks aroused him. No conspiracy to overthrow the old and start a new sect impelled him. He was fully a child of the mediaeval church until, in the silence of his cell, poring over the open pages of Scripture as he prepared himself for his lectures, a sudden change broke upon him. When he was made a D.D. in 1512, so he informs us, he did not know what the passage meant "The just shall live by faith" or the meaning of "God's righteousness." But, as the ontological argument suddenly flashed upon the mind of the great Schoolman, Anselm, in the dark hours of the night when he was on his bed, so the meaning of the Pauline words flashed upon Luther suddenly and, again to follow his own words, flung open to him the very gates of paradise. The struggles of months were brought to an end (as also in the case of Anselm his painful meditations in search of a simple proof of the divine existence).

To Luther's own narrative remarkable corroboration has been given in the manuscripts of his lectures on the Psalms and on the Romans, delivered before 1517 and recently discovered. From the lectures on the Romans, which we have in the very manuscript copywritten by his own hand, it appears that he had discarded the philosophy of the "accursed heathen," Aristotle, thus breaking with the consent of the Middle Ages and, setting aside all the Schoolmen as authorities except St. Bernard, he had chosen Augustine as his master guide among theologians and expositors, of Holy Writ. Well before 1517, he was an heretic of heretics in the bud.

John Calvin's religious change was the result of "a sudden conversion" as he called it. By this *subita conversio*, as he says, he was transferred, as it were, from the mire and his feet set on the rock." After trying," he asserts "by all the ways of the Catholic faith to reach peace, I

failed and finally, frightened and with tears I took God's way." All sorts of psychological explainings may be attempted to account for the passage of these Reformers from the old system to the new as has been recently done by the eminent scholars, Denifle and Grisar, but they all break to pieces upon the simple facts that Luther and Calvin came to their views in the careful study of the Scriptures and apart from any collusion to break up the old system.

2. In their careers the two men differed widely. No mortal man of historic note has had so many dramatic scenes in his career as Luther. As Dr. Stalker, in view of these war times, has recently said so ingenuously: "Luther was a child of genius, if there ever was one and he battled his way in the face of incredible obstacles to the highest pinnacle of fame. . . . The great stages of his life were truly dramatic, yet there was mingled with them an element of pathos and homeliness by which they are invested with an atmosphere of romance." The essence of that element of pathos seems to me to have consisted in Luther's apparent utter unconsciousness of the importance of that which he was doing and his lonely and unaided fidelity to what he believed to be the truth of God.

John Calvin, too, had stirring episodes in his career but they have the appearance of being personal occurrences rather than events of world-wide significance. He did not stand alone and combat the sale of indulgences; he did not meet the papal anathema nor defend in high scholastic debate the memory of Huss and repudiate the infallibility of general councils. He did not before the open tribunal of worldly sovereignty assert the compulsive imperative of conscience and Scripture. True to his convictions he also was. He withstood the council and, with Farel, suffered banishment from Geneva. In a grave crisis, when the church's jurisdiction over the Lord's table was threatened by Berthelier and the state, he declared from the pulpit and in the face of a mob that he would rather die than surrender the Church's supreme right to self government.

Against bitter and persistent opposition he sought to make Jehovah lord and king. We will not say that one was more heroic than the other but the events of Luther's life were of the essence of the Reformation as a world movement. They belong as parts of the onward march of history.

3. If we now turn to the religious institutions they opposed and the new tenets they advocated, we find that Luther and Calvin agreed to a remarkable degree. With equal determination they joined in resisting the mediaeval system as it found expression in the papal monarchy, the sacramental system and the sacerdotal theory—the three elements upon which the Schoolmen laid the stress of their theological construction.

They advocated the parity of the ministry and the unsacerdotal character of its performances. The minister's first work and his most important work is to teach, to expound the Scriptures. Luther and Calvin were themselves master preachers. Of Luther Melancthon said "one is an interpreter, one a logician, another an orator but Luther is all in all." Luther gave a noble suggestion for the pulpit when he said: "Accursed are those preachers who aim at high and hard things."

On the four hundredth anniversary of Calvin's birth, 1909, Doumergue read from Calvin's pulpit in St. Pierre passage after passage which the great Reformer had uttered there and the atmosphere of the venerable edifice seemed heavy with the stillness of a sacred awe and yet vocal with the Higher Presence.

These two Reformers were again agreed in insisting upon the education of the people. Through the Puritans Calvin became the father of the public school system of this country as through Knox of the parish school system of Scotland. In Geneva all children—children of the poor as well as the rich—were to be obliged to go to school. Years before Calvin had put his scheme of popular education into practice, Luther had sent out a special appeal calling upon officials in all German towns to see to it that children, girls

and boys, go to school, primarily that they might be intelligent Christians but also that the home might have well-behaved members and the state well-trained citizens. "Yea," he said, "though there were no soul nor heaven nor hell but only civil government yet would schools be required." He betrayed his own artistic tastes when he prescribed, as a part of the curriculum, music, vocal and instrumental. Knox also prescribed sang schules. Calvin's influence was characteristically shown in the action of the House of Commons when, sending back to the Westminster Assembly a portion of its work for revision, it insisted upon every one's being taught to read that he might read the Scriptures for himself. Luther's influence has born fruit in his own native land which shows by several percent the smallest percentage of illiteracy over all other countries in the world.

In these two ways these two Reformers defined the function of the ministry and the intellectual rights of all of every rank.

In the two leading spiritual principles of the Reformation, the final authority of the Scriptures and justification by faith, they were fully agreed. In the use of Scripture, it must be avowed, they were free where their disciples of after generations were painstaking in constructing theories of verbal and plenary inerrancies. Calvin denied the Petrine authorship of the second epistle which goes by his name and found mistakes in the sacred page as in Stephen's speech, whether Stephen's mistake or the mistake of the sacred reporter. Luther observed that, even if Moses did not write the books ascribed to him, yet were they inspired.

It is true that, in their theory of the Lord's Supper, Luther and Calvin differed as also in the consequent theory of the ubiquity of Christ's body. Luther's conduct in the controversy with Zwingli at Marburg, 1529, and in his tirades later we can only deplore both for their uncharitable obstinacy and their baneful effect in retarding the spread of the Reformation. It is said that Luther, reading one of

Calvin's treatments of the Lord's Supper, declared that, if such exposition had been made years before, there would have been no open controversy. But in the main thing these two Reformers were agreed in that they set aside the dogma of transsubstantiation and all mutation of the elements by the word of the priest, "creating God." The conflicts which were waged between the followers of Luther and Calvin over the theory of the Lord's Supper is one of the pitiful chapters in Church history, one we would fain have blotted out. The observance of our Lord's command is so big a thing that we should refuse to be aliens one from the other over the views we take of the exact method of his presence. It is, to say the least, as much a duty, according to the Scriptures, to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace as to insist upon precise rectitude of theological statement.

4. As between Luther and Calvin in the method of apprehending truth and treating it,—Luther found the truth by instinctive perception. His spiritual and intellectual insight was immediate. He had some of the mystical faculty of the Apostle John and John Tauler and the mystical treatise *The German Theology*. He saw the truth and felt it. Calvin reached the truth by the intellectual and reflective faculty, through a process. I do not know that either surpassed the other in the precision of their apprehension of biblical meanings and their perception of the deep things of the Spirit. Luther's commentaries, say on the Romans and Galatians, are full of religious insight and spiritual fervor. The Commentary on the Galatians influenced the author of the *Pilgrim's Progress* and the leader of the Methodist revival. Luther saw deep into the mysteries of saving faith and the merciful provision of God in Christ and he knew, if ever man knew, the mind of St. Paul. Calvin was the pathfinder in critical investigation of the biblical text. His statements are deliberate, weighed in the scales of a well-balanced judicial faculty. I do not recall, however, that any two characters such as Bunyan and John

Wesley were ever savingly influenced by his strong and lucid expositions. Luther translated the Scriptures for his people: Calvin furnished critical expositions, the model for later commentators.

Luther's tracts came from a soul aflame like one of our crucible furnaces. They aroused Europe. Calvin constructed the orderly statement of the new views. His Institutes and his Reply to Sadollet taught the Protestant theologians of Western Europe. Many a divine felt as did our own John Cotton "who was wont to sweeten his mouth with a piece of Calvin before he went to sleep." Melancthon called him "the Theologian" as centuries before Jerome had called Gregory Nazianzen. The one Reformer was moved by the enthusiasm of a great cause, the other by the logic of a great system. The personality of Luther is a cardinal epoch in history. Calvin has his place in a group. He is classed with Augustine and Thomas Aquinas. In the discovery and proclamation of religious truth, Calvin was not original. What he advocated and defended Luther had already set forth. The doctrine of predestination Luther and Zwingli had held and propounded with as much confidence as did Calvin. Six years before Calvin was converted Luther discussed that subject at length with Erasmus. When Calvin discussed it in his writings directed against Bolsec and Pighius, he often referred to his great forerunner and adding nothing to the reasonableness of the argument constantly goes back to Augustine to whom both were indebted.

As for exhaustive explanations of deep spiritual themes, Luther's feeling, I suppose, followed the line of his answer to the following question: "As God knew that man would fall, why did God create men?" Some one asked. Luther replied "God knew quite well what He was about. Let us keep clear of such abstract questions and consider the will of God as it has been revealed to us." It is not to disparage Calvin to say that he had some of the Schoolmen's assurance that to all theological questions a satisfactory

answer can be given in terms of reasonable explanation. The Turretins followed this instinct and our own Jonathan Edwards.

As Melancthon said, Luther brought the Apostles out from the prison and darkness in which they had lain for centuries. Calvin did not find any new spiritual light in the Scriptures which Luther had not found. It is for this reason that Roman Catholic controversialists have directed their guns against Luther.

5. The service of Calvin to Protestantism as a spiritual movement was very distinct and very great. He gave to Protestantism permanent standing among the peoples of Western Europe, a thing which Luther was unable to do. The English Reformers were first Lutherans. They turned to Calvin. A few years ago, in a letter to a Hungarian professor, Professor Harnack very cordially recognized the debt of Western Europe to Calvin.

6. And this brings us to the very important element in which Calvin went beyond the German Reformer. He was original in the department of administration. He was the founder of a form of Church government and has become the father of representative institutions in the modern world. Here he had genius where Luther was lacking, was constructive where Luther was a child. Calvin was a legislator and a disciplinarian. His mind ran in the direction of rules. It demanded a system. Luther had no taste for administration. No *civitas dei* lay in his mind as an ideal to be realized in an outward organized institution. He had no concern for regulations. His mind did not run along the line of enactments. His work was done when he had borne witness to leading religious principles,—when he had exalted the Christian man as against the pope and all hierarchies, when he had exalted the rule of conscience in the face of the chief living earthly sovereign; when he had given the Scriptures to his people as the rule of all living; when he had borne testimony to the propinquity of Christ to every penitent believer—then his work was done. He

had no gift for arrangements and was helpless when it came to policies. His visitation of the Saxon churches was an incident in his career.

Little Wittenberg was too remote, it may be said, to start the brain of the administrator. No governmental problems had thrust themselves into its humdrum political life as had been the case in Geneva. The statement accounts for nothing. In a thousand Genevas, Luther would not have been an administrator.

In Geneva, Calvin found the civic problem as pressing as it could have been found in any part of Europe at that time. The city had been a seething pot of political aspirations. The bishop had been obliged to divide his power with the lords of Savoy and both, in 1387, had been forced in a constitution of 79 articles to grant to the Genevan state popular assemblies and representative councils. The cantons of Freiburg and Bern, with their free constitutions, had been looked to for protection by the democratic element and patriots, like Berthelier and Bonivard, by their struggles and violent deaths had furnished a chapter in the history of democratic progress. When Calvin in 1536, following the compulsive urgency of Farel, made Geneva his fixed abode, representative institutions were at work there. Himself, he at first preferred the aristocratic form of government as the least liable to abuse. However, he fell in with the representative method and elaborated it in the ecclesiastical constitution which we call the Presbyterian form but generically the Puritan—whether Congregational or presbyteral—and in large suggestions which, taken up by his immediate disciples, became the norm of representative institutions and democracy in modern states. Calvin would have been a legislator and disciplinarian anywhere, in Wittenberg or San Marino probably as much as in the metropolis on Lake Leman.

7. In the domain of the Church, Calvin's legislation provided that the Christian commonwealth is to be administered by its constituency through elected representatives.

The ideal was the very opposite of the papal monarchy or a hierarchy, self-perpetuating though both claim divine sanction or, on the other hand, of the system of state control and state appointment though this system was retained in ecclesiastical matters in Geneva till the separation of church and state by popular vote in 1909. The system exalted the rights of the laity. The consistory of Geneva—or, as we call it, the presbytery—consisted of ministers and twelve lay elders. The system exalted the freedom and dignity of the pulpit. Calvin and the Reformed symbols laid stress upon a divine call to the ministry, a call discovered to the consistory by a thorough examination into the intellectual furnishing and the moral purpose of the candidate. Not in sacramental performances but in knowledge of the Scriptures and moral aims are we to look for the indispensable qualifications of the clergymen. The Puritan pulpit needs no panegyrist. At times in history, without doubt, it went too far in speaking of matters belonging to the political domain. At times, it has given way morally to the blandishments of episcopacy and the threats of the civil power. But, upon the whole, it has been an iron tonic wherever it has been set up. Somewhat rudely, no doubt, in cases, but fearlessly, it has stood for the things of God as against human devices, for righteousness against the practise of accommodation, and for reality against pretence.

8. Calvin's idea of church government necessarily influenced the theory of civil government,—necessarily because to the men who were Calvinists the Scriptures were compulsive over all modes of enactment. Green remarks that the national synod, which Theodore of Tarsus introduced into England in the seventh century, formed the "mould on which the civil organization of the state quite settled itself," through the unification of the land under one jurisdiction of king and parliament. The representative principle could not be confined to the government of the Church for the freedom of the Christian man can not be confined to the ecclesiastical domain. In his *Institutes* and

here and there in his commentaries on the Prophets Calvin set forth two germinative ideas bearing on the civil realm. Rulers, in accordance with Romans xiii. are to be obeyed in all things and even under much provocation *except* where their acts contravene the dictates of the conscience enlightened by the Word of God. The second idea was that it is meet that the people through representatives, as the ephori in Sparta and the tribunes in Rome, should supervise the administration of civil rulers and, where necessary, rebuke and check them.

Calvin's paragraphs on government in the Institutes, iv: 21, 31 the Puritans of this country were never weary in quoting and they became the powerful incentives in the liberties and self justification of the New England colonies.¹ That strict Calvinist in doctrine, Robert South, knew well the mighty influence of Calvin in modifying the theory of the divine right of kings of which South was an uncompromising advocate. In one of his sermons, that notable preacher spoke of Calvin, the great mufti of Geneva, as advocating anti-monarchical doctrines and haying the face to defend them in his Institutes. Calvin came to this frame of mind on government as the years wore on in Geneva, until he set forth government by common consent as "the best condition by far" and his last edition of the Institutes, by his own hand, 1559 commended government "in the hands of the many."

Calvin's pupils and the school of jurisconsults in Geneva elaborated this conception of civil government with increasing boldness. In 1556, Ponet, afterwards bishop of Winchester, in his *Politike Power*, which John Adams declared to contain "all the essential principles of liberty afterwards dilated up by Sidney and Locke," went far in saying that princes might be deposed by the body of the congregation or commonwealth. Two years later, 1558, three pastors and one elder of the English congregation in Geneva issued

¹ Hart in *American Hist. as told by Contemporaries*, i; 324-330, gives the passage.

eight political tracts addressed to England and Scotland to show how far superior powers are to be obeyed, a discussion which Calvin pronounced true but "somewhat harsh." The Genevan Bible, of 1557, known as the Puritan Bible, greatly offended James I and the strict advocates of the divine right of kings by its incisive notes on the rights of the congregation and the right of peoples to resist tyrants. Beza, Calvin's successor, and Hotman, also of the university of Geneva, in special treatises went further still in the assertion of the two propositions that rulers are responsible to the Word of God and that a virtual compact exists between rulers and people so that when rulers cease to help the people or defy the Word of God, they may be set aside. Lawyers in Heidelberg took up this advocacy. The Huguenot Mornay, the author of the *Vindiciae contra tyrannos*, 1579, applied the principle when he gave to William the Silent the counsel that, as Philip II had broken his obligations, his royal rule over the Netherlands was no longer binding.

In England, Cartwright set forth the same views of popular sovereignty. John Knox applied them in his attitude to Mary Queen of Scotland. "Think you" said the young sovereign, "that subjects having power may resist their princes by resort to violence?" "If princes exceed their bounds, no doubt they may" was the reply. "I am in the place where I am demanded by my conscience to speak the truth and therefore I speak, impugn it who list" he said again. Pity that in this age the Roman church should beatify Mary while it sees nothing to honor in the man among Scotch men. The principle "that there is between all lords and vassals" a mutual obligation was given expression in Scottish law. The Long Parliament and Cromwell took the same ground and voted the execution of Charles I whose promises were never kept. The principles found codified expression in the Dutch Declaration of Independence, 1581, the Solemn League and Covenant, in the Instrument of Government of 1653 and in the Fundamental

Orders of Connecticut and other New England documents and, we are accustomed to say, in the Mecklenburg Declaration and in the Declaration of Independence.

Calvinism became the expounder and defender of free institutions in France, Holland, England, Scotland and this country. It is also true that Calvinism became intolerant and even tyrannical in Geneva, in England and Scotland and our New England states but within it as of its very essence resided the principles of divine sovereignty and individual dignity and these constrained it in spite of noteworthy exponents to state and finally grant liberty of opinion as in the act of tolerating the Anabaptists in Holland and the declaration of the Westminster Confession that "God alone is lord of the conscience." And we recall that that true spiritual son of Calvin, Roger Williams was the first to incorporate full "soul liberty" into a state constitution.

9. As to the matter of the relation of church and state as it stood in Calvin's mind and the practice of Geneva, it would lead too far to enter into that subject at any length. But a statement of it must be made in order to form a judgment of Calvin's character and of Calvin in comparison with Luther. The subject exercised Calvin's constructive intellect. For Luther apparently it was never a matter of serious reflection. That Reformer took for granted a peaceable and healthy cooperation of the two realms, both submitting to the rule of the Word of God. Calvin was the author of the Ecclesiastical Ordinances of Geneva, the other committeemen appointed by the civil authority to serve with him offering as is probable only moral and confirmatory aid. The code passed by popular vote 1543 and revised 1559, regulated the customs and discipline of the Genevan church. Calvin was likewise active in framing the civil code and, in 1542, the council gave him release from preaching during the week that he might give himself to the work of its preparation. His purpose was to make the two spheres of church and state coordinate and complimentary. He wrote to a friend that it was his pur-

pose to keep them separate: *volui, sicut æquum est, spirit-ualem potestatem a civili judicio distingui*. But, in fact, in Geneva and later in New England they overlapped so that the state exercised functions we now deny to it and the church overstepped its domain in interfering with civil affairs and the appointment of civil officials. Infractions of the first table of the law were punished with the severest physical penalties even unto death as well as infractions of the second table,—atheism, blasphemy, the denial of the trinity, as well as murder. The state appointed lay elders, however acknowledging in 1560 that it had been a pernicious usurpation to appoint them without taking the advice of the clergy.

Servetus was put to death for two crimes, the denial of infant baptism and blasphemy against the Trinity. Bolsec, Pighius and others were banished for denying the decree of predestination. Torture was applied and with Calvin's consent, though he several times complained at the severity of its application. Liberty of printing was suppressed and complaints against civil sentences punished. Parents were forbidden giving certain names to children. The key to every home was at the disposal of the consistory. Roman Catholic writers find in the administration of Genevan affairs the Inquisition without the name. Compulsion took the place of persuasion or at best was added to it. No dissent was tolerated.

The annals, detailing the enforcement of the codes of Geneva, are not pleasant reading. The city had a population of 12000 and in three months, in 1545, thirty-four were executed for witchcraft. From 1542 to 1546 more than eight hundred were seized, fifty-eight put to death and seventy-six exiled. In 1546, so the keepers reported, the prisons were full. The same severity was shown for offenses coming strictly under the supervision of the ecclesiastical authority. From Feb. 1557 to February 1562, 1286 persons were excommunicated from the fellowship of the church.

Vain is the attempt, in my judgment, to excuse Calvin on the ground that he held no official position in the city government. He was consulted on all matters. Lists of offenders were put into his hands for scrutiny and judicial decision. He was prosecutor at the trial of Servetus. After the Spaniard's death Calvin justified his execution in a special pamphlet and he also defended in treatises the banishment of Bolsec and others for doctrinal dissents.

And unsatisfactory is the apology on the ground that many of the best of his contemporaries approved what was going on in Geneva. But all did not. Voices of dissent were found not only in the city but outside the city and Bern was aggrieved. It is an anomaly that Calvin should have joined such profound knowledge of the Scriptures with unyielding severity towards religious dissidents.

The Genevan method has been defended on the ground of the lawlessness which invaded the path of the Protestant movement. Such lawless elements appeared in Germany. It seemed at times as if anarchy might be the fatal stumbling block of Protestantism. The severe regimen of Geneva, it has been argued was necessary to conserve the spiritual principles of the Reformation and perpetuate the movement against this lawlessness from within and the insidious encroachments of Jesuistry from without. The argument has standing ground and the bitter legislation may have been in the positive purpose of Providence.

These things aside, we will remember that Geneva became the bulwark of Protestant liberties, the outpost of liberal education for Western Europe and the model of a well-ordered community. The Huguenots turned their faces and their feet towards Geneva as to a new Jerusalem. John Knox's eulogy, which compared it to the best organized society since the days of the Apostles, is a permanent bit of literature. Geneva became the model state of Europe for moral order.

10. We are now ready to compare Luther and Calvin from the standpoints of personal piety and of humane sym-

pathies. Luther's piety was shown in the beautiful Christian spirit which runs through his tract the *Freedom of the Christian Man*—praised no less by Catholic writers than by Protestant. His hymns on the incarnation are not excelled for childlike simplicity and religious feeling and his great hymn continues to be sung on solemn anniversaries in Protestant lands. His prayers are full of tenderness including one of almost unique simplicity and fervor in his death hour. Calvin's prayers in the Genevan liturgy breathe the full spirit of reverence and tremble with the sense of sin and unworthiness. In his single hymn "I greet thee, who my sure Redeemer art" he too touched the tenderest chord of religious emotion. Nevertheless there seem to be distinguishing qualities in their devotion. Luther's is the childlike trust and confidence; Calvin's an overpowering sense of the immanence of God. To the one God is more the confiding friend, to the other the sovereign and almighty judge; to both equally near. To Luther the deliverance by the atonement seems to have been the governing reality; to Calvin the righteousness which undelay it and which it demands. It was just like Luther to say "Jesus Christ Himself is my immediate bishop, abbot, prior, father, lord and master."² Calvin exalted the motive of duty. This sense of duty nerved Knox so that, over his grave, the regent could say: "Here lies he who never feared the face of man." It made the men of the Long Parliament and Cromwell. It expressed itself in the words of Beza: "Sir, it is the lot of the church in whose name I speak, to endure blows not to strike them. But also, may it please you to remember, it is an anvil which has worn out many hammers." It invested Calvin himself with a singular grandeur as a moral personality pursuing an unyielding determination towards the aim of a regenerated commonwealth. There is something very admirable in Luther's letter to John Tetzel offering him comfort when the Catholic party

² Jesus Christus ipse est meus immediatus episcopus, abbas, prior, pater, dominus et magister. On Monastic Vows, Weimar ed., VIII. 376.

was making him the scape-goat for the Wittenberg disturbance. There is something unparalleled in history about the spectacle afforded by the dying Reformer, his frame wasted with studies and physical infirmities, receiving into his chamber the Genevan councils and the ministers of the city and listening to the tribute of their respect and begging their pardon for the exhibitions of temper he had shown. One thing is notable in Puritan history. Puritanism has not been ashamed of apologies when it has felt it has offended against God. A spiritual biography resides in the words which the council recorded of Calvin after his death *un homme de si grande majesté*. Renan pronounced him "the most Christian man of his age."

II. The humanity of Luther has attracted the attention of Carlyle, Froude, Tulloch and other English writers. He was the most human of men. Both Reformers were married but Luther's home stands out in the history of the home circle, with its trust in his wife and his playful affectionateness which fills the letters addressed to her, his interest in his children, translating for them Aesop's fables, singing at the Christmas tree, writing to his little Hans about heaven, weeping as if his great frame would be shattered to pieces at the death-bed of his daughter Lena, taking his boys with him on his last journey to his birthplace, the journey that terminated in his death. He was overflowing in his love for nature, the flowers, the birds, the trees, suggesting the male and female principle as running through all created things. He gathered the hunted hare in his arms on the Wartburg, reminding us of our own commoner president who turned aside on the road to Springfield to restore some little birds which had fallen from their nest. He loved music, declaring it next to the Gospel to be the best medicine of the soul. His humor was overflowing. It does not forsake him even when he speaks of the pope or the devil. His Table Talk abounds in human interests and sage remarks. In the experiences of his last years there is something most human,—disenchantment and weariness at having outlived his time.

Luther lives in the hearts of his people as Knox in the hearts of his people though not in the same measure. Luther's home is the model home. His Christmas songs are sung by every Protestant German household at Christmas time. His independence and his courage are the pattern for his people. Döllinger with master hand remarked that Luther gave to his people what no other man ever gave to a people, its Bible, its catechism and its hymnbook and, after four centuries, they so remain. He is the chief German personality and his soul has entered into the German people.

Of Calvin men think as austere, but unsocial; unsympathetic with the common instincts of mankind though at death master of himself and the situation. He is still an exile. His career and his work remain those of an alien in the land which gave him birth. His own city of Geneva has repudiated his theology at what is regarded as its central thought. This is the pathos of *his* career and it is people who speak another language than the language he spoke who admire him as a commanding moral figure and a benefactor of mankind.

The one, with Melanchthon at his side, sleeps in front of the altar of the church on whose door at midday he struck the article against the sale of indulgences, the first article of the universal Protestant Reformation,—the day which James Anthony Froude has pronounced “the most memorable day in modern history.” But Luther is German after all. Calvin sleeps in a grave which no man can find for by his direction it was unmarked; but his spirit, unnational, holds with a mysterious spell the minds of men in the Protestant world who search for the deep motive of life, life in its reality, and the best form of the social organism. Like the great white birch and pine side by side at my door in the Northern woods, these two men stand abreast in the pathway of what we call modern history,—the one tall and overhanging, with a cluster of branches at the top, the other tall and straight with two or three outstretched branches

and some dead ones still clinging below. Both have withstood the vehemence of the Western storms and both are seen from afar with admiration and gratitude.

Like Francis d'Assisi and Dominic in the 13th centuries the two Protestant Reformers—in whom we hope even Roman Catholics will come to find something to admire—never met. But Calvin often quoted Luther, sent greetings to him as his “much respected father” and referred to him as having been raised up by God in the beginning to go before with the torch for finding the way of salvation.³ Luther, according to Melanchthon, held his younger co-laborer in “high esteem” and, when he read Calvin's Reply to Sadollet, exclaimed: “this book has hand and foot and I rejoice that God raises up men who will give the last blow to popery and finish the war against anti-Christ which I began.”

Of Luther, Melanchthon, who knew him best in his younger years and his later years, in his heroic strength and his weakness, exclaimed on hearing the news of his death: “The horseman and chariot of Israel is departed who ruled the church in these last evil times” and in his funeral address applied to him the words addressed to Abraham “a prince of God is among us.”

In the last paragraph of his biography of Calvin, Beza who knew Calvin during sixteen years, in the episodes of his stormy career and in his life in the study and knew him best, said: “In him all men may see an example of Christian character, an example which it is as easy to calumniate as it is difficult to imitate.”

To both the Protestant world owes its existence and human society a debt.

Pittsburgh, Pa.

DAVID S. SCHAFF.

³ de necessitate reform, eccles., Opp. vi: 459.

LUTHER AND THE PROBLEM OF AUTHORITY IN RELIGION

PART I

That the Reformation of the sixteenth century is one of the most important turning points in the history of the world is a statement whose validity is equalled only by its commonplaceness. In some sense Martin Luther, the pioneer and hero of the movement, must be deemed the prophet of a new age. He and his fellow leaders in the different lands of Europe changed the character of western civilization, sweeping away the hallowed traditions of a thousand years, and making the scenes of desolation blossom with a new life of wondrous vigor and beauty.

But as to the precise significance of the Reformation, and its specific relations to the modern era, there is only partial agreement. We are not here thinking primarily of those noted Ultramontane writers—Janssen, Pastor, Denifle, Weiss, Grisar, and the like—who by their literary skill, and especially by their ability and zeal in investigation have given a new lustre to recent Roman Catholic scholarship in the field of history, but whose interpretations of what they are pleased to regard as merely one of a series of defections from the bishop of Rome is a monstrous perversion of the facts. We are concerned, rather, with the wide divergence among Protestants themselves as to the meaning of the Reformation. Historians of the Ritschlian school quite generally have regarded Luther as having pathetically failed to fulfill the promise of his early public career, and Prof. Troeltsch, in a notable address delivered at Stuttgart in 1906, seriously proposed a new chronological division of history, by which the Middle Ages are to be extended to about 1700 A.D., and thus made to include two centuries of Protestantism.¹

¹ The Address was entitled "Die Bedeutung des Protestantismus für die Entstehung der modernen Welt." Cf. the translation, by W. Mont-

Specially significant, too, is the changed attitude² toward the custom, now almost a hundred years old, of representing the Reformation as the expression of two basal principles,—the so-called material principle, justification by faith alone, and the formal principle, the supreme and exclusive authority of the Scriptures in all matters of faith and conduct. Some critics of this dual formula prefer a trinity of principles, while others strive to secure a higher unity of the several elements, though at the expense, often enough, of what many Protestants will regard as essential factors.³

gomery, of the Address in expanded form, *Protestantism and Progress*, 1912; also Troeltsch, "Protestantisches Christentum und Kirche in der Neuzeit," in *Die Kultur der Gegenwart* i, Abt. iv (1906). For an incisive criticism of this unfair treatment of early Protestantism, see Fr. Loofs, *Luthers Stellung zum Mittelalter und zur Neuzeit*, Halle, 1907.

² Cf. A. Ritschl. "Über die beiden Prinzipien des Protestantismus," in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, i (1877), pp. 397 ff.; Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*⁴, p. 857, n. 1; Seeberg, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, ii (1898), p. 289; C. Stange, "A Ritschls Urteil über die beiden Prinzipien des Protestantismus," in *Theolog. Studien und Kritiken*, 1897, pp. 599 ff.

³ See, e.g., Ph. Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, vi, p. 16, where the "three fundamental principles" are the "supremacy of the Scriptures over tradition, the supremacy of faith over works, and the supremacy of the Christian people over an exclusive priesthood,"—though in the context the three are resolved "into the one principle of evangelical freedom or freedom in Christ." Schenkel, *Das Wesen des Protestantismus*, i, § 1, "corrects" the double formula in favor of a "theological, anthropological and theanthropological principle"; but in his later work, *Die Grundlehren des Christenthums*, 1877, p. 140, he likewise speaks of one principle,—"*Freiheit des Gewissens, Geistesfreiheit überhaupt, in Gebundenheit an die Wahrheit und an die Wahrheit der Offenbarung insbesondere.*" For other attempts to reduce the essence of the Reformation to a single principle, see P. Gennrich, *Der Kampf um die Schrift*, 1898, pp. 2 ff.; Seeberg, as cited, p. 289; Th. Kolde, *Luthers Stellung zu Concil und Kirche bis 1521*, pp. vii, 21; R. W. Dale, *Protestantism: Its Ultimate Principle*, p. 77 ("The direct access of the soul to God—the direct access of God to the soul"); Lommatzsch, *Luthers Lehre vom eth. rel. Standpunkt aus*, 1879, pp. 184 ff.; Adolf Bolliger, *Das Schriftprinzip der protestantischen Kirche einst, heute, in der Zukunft*, pp. 81 ff.; and—as typical of this whole school—A. Sabatier, *Les Religions d' Autorité Et La Religion De L'Esprit* (Livre Troisième, 1904).

Nor is it strange that the Reformed Churches, following in these respects the leadership of Zwingli and Calvin themselves, gave the place of primacy and honor to the Scriptures as the source of all doctrinal truth, and substituted for justification by faith alone the larger and more fruitful idea of the sovereignty of God, in his gracious work of election and salvation no less than in creation and revelation.

But undoubtedly it is the validity and adequacy of the formal principle of the Reformation—the normative authority of holy Scripture—that are to-day most seriously challenged. On the one hand, it is maintained, that the principle itself is not peculiar to the Reformation, and that therefore it cannot have the importance that has often been given to it in popular evangelical opinion.⁴ Attention is directed to the fact that not only the Schoolmen⁵ but also the so-called “Reformers before the Reformation”⁶—Goch, Wesel and Wessel—taught the supreme authority of the Scripture as the Word of God. How far some of these champions of reform ventured to go in their attacks upon ecclesiastical traditions may be seen in Occam’s bold declaration, that while the pope can err the sacred Scripture cannot err, and that a heretical pope should be deposed.⁷

It would, however, be a great mistake to suppose that the Scripture principle was the same thing for those medieval leaders that it was for Luther and his fellow Reformers.⁸

⁴ Loofs, *Luthers Stellung, etc.*, p. 9.

⁵ J. Köstlin, *Luthers Theologie*² (1901), ii, p. 7; Seeberg, *op. cit.*, ii, pp. (4 f.) 84, 176 f.; but compare also pp. 177 ff.

⁶ Loofs, *Leitfaden, etc.*,⁴ pp. 656 ff., Seeberg, as cited, ii, p. 194, *et passim*.

⁷ Cf. F. Kropatscheck, “Occam und Luther. Bemerkungen zur Geschichte des Autoritätsprinzips,” in *Beiträge zur Förderung christl. Theologie* (Vierter Jahrg., 1900), pp. 64 ff.; Seeberg, as cited, p. 153; and Seeberg, *Realencyklopädie f. prot. Theol. u. Kirche*,³ art. “Ockham,” pp. 272 ff.

⁸ Harnack, while careful to stress the “new” in Luther’s evangelicalism, yet regards his attitude toward the Scriptures as one of the most deplorable of the many “remnants” of Catholicism which he retained; *Lehrbuch, etc.*,⁴ iii, pp. 868, 878. According to Harnack, Luther’s views on this subject present a hopeless contradiction, because on the one

As we shall hope to show, Luther's solution of the problem of authority in religion presupposes a radically different conception of the Christian's relation to the Bible.⁹

On the other hand, granting that the formal principle is an essential characteristic of Protestantism, we find that there are still—as there ever have been—broad differences of opinion, as between conservatives and liberals, between the "orthodox" and the rationalistically inclined theologians, in regard to the grounds upon which Luther himself based the validity of the principle. The question is still being asked, and the answers are very varied—What was Luther's attitude to the Scriptures? Are his views self-consistent? Is he justly to be regarded as a forerunner of Rationalism?

From what has been said it is clear that the familiar formula concerning the two principles of the Reformation is not, from the dogmatic point of view, altogether satisfactory. Nevertheless it affords a useful method of discriminating between two elements in evangelical experience—between two phases of evangelical thought—which, though capable of being logically separated, must ever be kept in living relationship with each other.

In Martin Luther we have a world-historical illustration of the significance of the vital union of these two principles in a commanding religious genius, in a "personality pure and free in God."¹⁰ By an extraordinary experience of the grace of God in Christ Jesus—mediated to him, not indeed directly, yet really, by the Bible,¹¹ he came to the

hand, he accepted "the Rabbinic-Catholic conception of the verbal inspiration of the Scripture," while on the other hand, he "criticized the Scripture" and "dissolved Catholicism in its historical beginnings" (*ibid.*, p. 858); *cf.* *Lehrbuch*, 3rd. ed., pp. 771, 772, 781, 791 f.

⁹ In general, as to the limitations of even the most advanced of the medieval critics of the authority of the hierarchy, see Seeberg, *op. cit.*, ii, pp. 132, 174, 177 ff.; Loofs, *Leitfaden*,⁴ p. 658; and *cf.* Kropatscheck, *op. cit.*, p. 74 ("Occam ist in der Kirchengeschichte nicht das einzige Beispiel dafür, dass das Schriftprincip an sich noch nicht das Evangelium bringt.")

¹⁰ Dorner, *History of Protestant Theology*, i, p. 82.

¹¹ See below, p. 563.

joyous assurance that he was re-born and saved, and then seeing the "entire Scripture"¹² in the light of his new faith, he little by little, not without occasional misgivings and temporary retrogressions, yet on the whole with ever-increasing boldness and thoroughness set the testimony of Scripture against and over all other authorities.

In discussing Luther's relation to the problem of authority in religion, therefore, we shall first consider the development, in his own religious experience and his career as a Reformer, of the principle of the supreme normative authority of the sacred Scripture, and then we shall try to indicate the main features of his teaching in regard to the nature of the Scripture as such authority.

* * * *

On the 17th of July, 1505, Luther entered the Augustinian convent at Erfurt. He took the step under the constraint of deep religious convictions. He hoped by the conscientious performance of monastic duties to "do enough" to "obtain a gracious God."¹³ And as in those days fear¹⁴ was generally the dominant motive in the religious life, he too was specially influenced by the dread of death and of the divine wrath to be revealed in the final judgment.

We cannot give a detailed account of Luther's experiences as a monk, nor of the steps that led to his gradual conversion to the evangelical faith.¹⁵ Only a few of the most important facts can be hinted at.

¹² *Lutheri Opp. Lat. var. arg.* (Erlangen), i, 23: "*ibi iustitiam Dei coepi intelligere eam, qua iustus dono Dei vivit, nempe ex fide. . . . Hic me prorsus renatum esse sensi, et apertis portis in ipsam paradisum intrasse. Ibi continuo alia mihi facies totius scripturae apparuit. Discurrebam deinde per scripturas. . .*"

¹³ *Werke*, Erlangen ed., 16, p. 90.

¹⁴ Cf. Lindsay, *A History of the Reformation*, i, pp. 127 ff., 188. Michael Angelo's Last Judgment, in the Sistine Chapel, is true to the then popular notion that only by the pleading of the gracious Virgin can the avenging arm of Christ—more an angry Judge than a merciful Savior—be averted.

¹⁵ It is particularly this early chapter in his life that has called forth

The only books that Luther took with him into the monastery were Plautus and Virgil. But it would be a mistake to interpret this interesting fact as meaning that, on his graduation in 1505 from the University of Erfurt—then justly celebrated as the chief centre in North Germany for the revival of classical studies,—he had become an ardent Humanist. Humanism had, indeed, made a permanent impression upon him, but by no means a decisive one.¹⁶ Melanchthon¹⁷ is our authority for the statement that in the

the vast controversial Luther literature of the recent past. Specially serviceable as a guide to the understanding of the problems raised by these publications, and as a critical treatment of the whole subject of Luther's religious and theological development, is Prof. Scheel's "Die Entwicklung Luthers bis zum Abschluss der Vorlesung über den Römerbrief," in *Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte*, xxvii Jahrg., 1910, pp. 6.-230. In his *Leitfaden*, etc.,⁴ Prof. Loofs has given a sketch of Luther's ideas during his formative period that is admirable alike for its comprehensiveness and its conciseness. J. Köstlin's *Luthers Theologie*,² 1901, is an invaluable supplement to his biography of Luther, though, as Scheel in the article just named has shown, the work is not free from minor inaccuracies; cf. also Scheel, *Luthers Stellung zur heiligen Schrift*, pp. 5, 7.

¹⁶ A single glance at his "Dictata super Psalterium" 1513-1516, *Werke*, Weimer ed., iii, iv, shows that he had not, even at that time, abandoned the medieval in favor of the new Humanistic exegetical methods. Cf. the excellent monograph by Joh. Preuss, *Die Entwicklung des Schriftprinzips bei Luther bis zur Leipziger Disputation*, 1901. This treatise gives an almost exhaustive list of references to the sources pertaining to this theme, and we take occasion here to express our deep indebtedness to this author. One can only regret that he did not utilize the material at his command for a systematic presentation of the teachings of Luther concerning the Scripture principle. On the relation of Luther to the Humanists, see p. 4.

¹⁷ *Corpus Reformatorum*, vi, p. 159. Luther counts himself among the "moderni" or Nominalists: *Werke*, Weimar ed., ix, p. 9 f.; cf. *Opp. Lat. var. arg.* (Erlangen) 5, p. 137 (1520): "*sum enim Occanicae factionis*." This and the further fact that his two chief teachers in philosophy, Trutvetter and von Usingen, were "moderni" favoring the conciliar as against the curialistic theory of the government of the papal Church, should put us on our guard against unduly stressing the statement made by Luther in 1545, that he had been "*ebrius, imo submersus in dogmatibus papae*" (*Opp. Lat. var. arg.* i, p. 16). Cf. Scheel, *Luthers Stellung*, etc., p. 13. In practice, however, the Nominalists were submissive members of the Church; see n. 9.

convent Luther became intimately acquainted with the later Nominalists, especially Occam, d'Ailly, and Biel, and Luther's own writings show that while from the beginning of his struggle for peace of conscience there was an anti-Nominalistic element in his thinking,¹⁸ he nevertheless showed traces of the influence of these Schoolmen, especially in his eucharistic controversies, to the end of his life. Some of the bolder declarations of these critics of the papal institutions became useful allies to the Reformer in the opening period of his conflict with Rome. But these authorities did not and could not help him in securing a truly evangelical knowledge of the Scriptures. On the contrary, he became filled with despair when, brooding over their speculations concerning predestination, he began to doubt that he was one of the elect.¹⁹ Gerson's practical, devotional tendencies gave the unhappy monk only occasional relief.²⁰

Nor did his perusal of the church fathers directly help him in the crisis of his religious experience. As for Augustine, whom he later so highly prized, and whom as early as 1509 he called the "*nunquam satis laudatus*," it is evident²¹ that he knew nothing of the great North African at first hand before about that very year, when, apparently quite casually, he fell upon some of his works in the library of the Erfurt convent. Scheel is even inclined to place this discovery of Augustine, not in the first, but in the second Erfurt period,²² which began in the fall of 1509 and lasted the greater part of two years. Augustine subsequently proved a mighty inspiration and comfort to Luther in his study of the Scriptures, in his assertion of their authority

¹⁸ Scheel, *Die Entwicklung Luthers, etc.*, p. 91. Cf. Seeberg, as cited, ii, p. 206.

¹⁹ These tortures belonged to "*has poenas . . . tantas ac tam infernales, quantas nec lingua dicere nec calamus scribere nec inexpertus credere potest*," referred to in *Werke*, Weim, ed., i, p. 557, ll. 33 ff. Cf. *Briefe* (ed. DeWette), v, p. 513.

²⁰ Köstlin, *M. Luther*,⁴ p. 81.

²¹ Scheel, *Die Entwicklung, etc.*, p. 123. Cf. Loofs, *Leitfaden*,⁴ p. 689, n. 5, and p. 690.

²² As cited, p. 123.

against the church traditions, and in the development of his theological views. But even after the crisis had been successfully passed, Luther took pains to guard his new-found faith against the imperfect evangelicalism of Augustine.²³

Of special interest, of course, is the question of the influence of the Scriptures themselves upon the monk during his life at Erfurt and at Wittenberg after his removal thither in 1508. He himself testifies that he had not seen a complete Bible until he was in his twentieth year, when he chanced to get hold of one in the university library.²⁴ On his entrance into the monastery a Latin version was given him by the brethren at his request, and he became a diligent student of the Word, being able to quote texts freely and even to tell the page of his copy on which they could be found. The Vicar-General of the order, von Staupitz, had in 1504 established the rule that "the novice shall eagerly read, devoutly hear and zealously learn the sacred Scripture."²⁵ But inner need was a sufficient inducement to the sin-sick monk for hard study of the Bible, and so far as the mere letter of Scripture was concerned, he was rapidly fulfilling the wish of Staupitz that he become a good "*textualis et localis*."

But the sacred volume was still a sealed book to him. The veil of medieval traditions lay over its pages and hid the true message. His sense of guilt due to his failures and transgressions as a monk, and especially his conviction of sin as an all-pervading evil and corrupting power in his heart brought him time and again to the brink of despair. If on one occasion, in more joyous mood, he felt he was

²³ Köstlin, *Luthers Theol.*,² i, p. 28.

²⁴ Cf. the less known testimony in regard to his colleague, Prof. Carlstadt, who had been a doctor of theology eight years before he began to study the Scriptures; Köstlin, *M. Luther*,⁴ p. 94.

²⁵ Benrath, "Luther im Kloster, 1505-1525," in *Schriften d. Ver. f. Reformationsgeschichte*, xxiii Jahrg., 1905, p. 35.

²⁶ Cf. his own maxim as to the "rechte Weise in der Theologia zu studiren,"—"Oratio, Meditatio, Tentatio,"; *Werke*, Erlangen ed., 63, pp. 403 f.

in the choir of angels,²⁷ the prevailing tone of his piety was that of one sorrowing for sins for which he knows no asceticism and self-mortification can atone, and for which he feels the just wrath of God is the only issue.

As often happens in similar mental struggles and spiritual agonies, it was the personal touch of a sympathetic friend or two that opened the way of deliverance. His teacher Usingen, in spite of his questionable advice that Luther should prefer the Schoolmen to the Bible, was a man of considerable pastoral wisdom and tact: Luther later recommended him to a tempted brother monk as the best possible comforter.²⁸ Melancthon further informs us, on the basis of frequent references to the matter by Luther, that it was an old monk that called Luther's attention to the meaning of faith, emphasized the clause in the Apostles' Creed, "I believe in the forgiveness of sins," and cited a telling passage concerning justification by faith from a sermon by St. Bernard.²⁹

To much the same purpose were the confidential talks of the Vicar-General. It was through him that "the light of the Gospel first began to shine" in the heart of the future Reformer.³⁰ Staupitz warned him against mourning for fictitious sins, and against indulging in idle speculations concerning the divine predestination, pointed him to the wounds of Christ, and bade him trust in God. To Staupitz Luther owed a new and truer understanding of the term "penitence."³¹

²⁷ *Opp. Exeget.* Erl. ed., 23, p. 401.

²⁸ *Briefe* (ed. deWette) i, p. 19 (April 15, 1516).

²⁹ *Corpus Ref.* vi, pp. 155, 159. Cf. Loofs, *Leitfaden*,⁴ p. 687.

³⁰ *Briefe* (deWette ed.), ii, p. 408 (Sept. 17, 1523). Schaff, *op. cit.*, vi, p. 119, n. 1, wrongly dates the letter in 1518.

³¹ *Briefe* (ed. deWette), i, 116 (1518). Cf. Scheel, *Die Entwicklung*, etc., p. 100 and n. 102, showing that Köstlin, *Luthers Theol.*, i, p. 24, mistakes the significance of Luther's reference to the time since which the once bitter term "poenitentia" has been sweet and pleasant to him. All that Luther implies is that at the time of the letter (1518) this change had taken place. There is no warrant for placing the change as early as the interview itself. For Luther conducted special biblical

Neither the time nor the specific effect of these interviews with Staupitz can be definitely determined; but it is probable that they took place before Luther went to Wittenberg (1508) and that they marked an important stage in his progress toward the evangelical faith, without, however, securing his immediate conversion thereto.³²

In October, 1508, Luther became professor of philosophy at the University of Wittenberg; in March 1509, he was made a bachelor of theology; on October 4, 1512, a licentiate of theology, and on October 19, 1512, a doctor of theology. This summary of events is symbolic of his early and of his whole career as a professor. He became an indefatigable

investigations to verify the new meaning of the word, and only thereafter—how near this was to the time of writing is not ascertainable—did he find pleasure in the word.

³² See especially Scheel, *Die Entwicklung, etc.*, pp. 100 ff., 109 ff., 116 ff.; 122 ff. In the main he agrees with Loofs, *Leitfaden*, pp. 687 f. His chief contention is that as early as 1508-09 Luther may have had a comforting experience of the grace of God, but that this was not marked by an evangelical knowledge of that passage (Rom. i, 17) with which, as we have seen (p. 557) he connects the great crisis in his early life. Scheel convincingly shows that the Marginal Notes on Augustine and the Lombard—about the only source from Luther himself from which we can draw for a knowledge of his ideas before 1513—are surcharged with the spirit of Biel, and that seemingly evangelical catchwords are to be taken in the traditional, not in any "reformatory" sense. Böhmer and Gottschick, according to Scheel, confuse Luther's experience of grace with his later understanding of the meaning of his experience. There is point also in what Scheel (pp. 125 ff.) urges as against Köstlin, (*Luthers Theol.*² i, pp. 32, 38), namely that Köstlin finds so little of theological significance in Luther's Notes on Augustine and the Lombard for the obvious reason that the too early dating of the decisive change—some time before these Lectures were given, *i.e.*, before 1509—leads him to expect too much in them. Though somewhat critical toward the Nominalists in these annotations, he even misinterprets Augustine in the interests of his own Nominalism. Cf. Scheel, *Luthers Stellung, etc.*, p. 14, as against Undritz ("Die Entwicklung des Schriftprinzips bei Luther in den Anfangsjahren der Reformation," in *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, viii, 1897, p. 570), who seems likewise to make the influence of Staupitz immediately decisive. Undritz's work is marred by numerous errors in his references and by other blemishes due to a misunderstanding of some of the sources.

student of the Scriptures.³³ Little by little, after long and hard struggles, he secured, through independent study of the Bible, a radically new knowledge of the way of eternal life, a knowledge that filled his soul with peace, and cast a bright radiance upon many a hitherto unintelligible statement of the Scriptures. This was his rebirth—his entrance into the paradise of evangelical freedom.³⁴ After this he read Augustine's *De spiritu et litera*, and was happy to find his idea of justification of faith confirmed.

³³ Emphasis has often been laid upon the fact that it was not, in the first instance, the Scriptures themselves which ministered comfort to the distressed monk, but rather the Word of God as current in the religious life of the church (the Creed, Bernard's sermons, and the like) and as reflected in the pious exhortations of such friends as Usingen, the unnamed old monk, and Staupitz. See, *e.g.*, Gennrich, *Der Kampf um die Schrift*, p. 4; Undritz, as cited, p. 569; Brieger, *Der Glaube Luthers in seiner Freiheit von menschlichen Autoritäten*, p. 25; Bolliger, as cited, p. 9. The fact is worthy of mention, but it is easy to give it a misleading significance. It is certainly not to be taken as if the Word of God had for Luther an existence utterly independent of the Scriptures. Cf. the careful statement of Dorner: "He was thus at first led to the light and peace, not through the reading of the Holy Scriptures, but just as little in an unhistorical and purely subjective way, but rather through the living utterance of the Church, although not in such a way that it was the authority of the Church which lent to the utterance its highest pacifying credentials and certainty; in his case, moreover, the postulate was not awaiting, that that utterance of the symbol regarding the forgiveness of sins, the subject matter, accordingly, which effected his salvation, be purely Christian and Scriptural; but neither was he brought to rest by the authority of the Scriptures, in which, previously to his experience in the faith, he had no living belief, although it is not to be denied that his development in the faith only reached a firm and clear conclusion, after he had become more intimate with the Holy Scriptures, especially with the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians" (*History of Protestant Theology*, i. p. 221). Cf. also Kunze, *Glaubensregel, Heilige Schrift und Taufbekenntnis*, p. 500, who rightly disparages the present tendency to magnify "was Luther 'erfuhr und erlebte'" and to forget that he had these experiences "ganz wesentlich an der Schrift und mit der Schrift." Berger, *Martin Luther in kulturgeschichtlicher Darstellung*, i, pp. 141 f., fails to do justice to the service that the Scripture, especially Paul, rendered Luther in his formative period; the "kulturgeschichtliche" considerations are not to be ignored, but neither are they to be taken as an adequate stimulus for Luther's "genius."

³⁴ See above, n. 12.

The date for this decisive change in his religious life and his theological thinking can be approximately fixed. On the one hand, the first Lectures on the Psalms (1513-1515) clearly reveal the new understanding of faith, justification and grace.³⁵ On the other hand, during his trip to Rome (1510 or 1511), his inner state—if we may accept the testimony concerning his ascent of the *santa scala*—is one of conflict and uncertainty. Furthermore, as has been said, the Notes on Augustine and the Lombard, dating from 1509 to 1511, cannot be interpreted satisfactorily in a truly evangelical sense.³⁶ The change must have taken place in 1512 or 1513, just before the Lectures on the Psalms were given.

The new faith became the principle of a new life. Battling for his own salvation, he made the victorious issue in his personal conflict his guide and criterion in his successful ministration to the spiritual needs of his age. He rediscovered the Gospel of Christ for his generation. Upon the basis of his new knowledge of salvation he advanced—quite commonly it was his foes who drove him forward—to oppose the antagonistic elements in the prevailing scholastic theology and in the whole mass of ecclesiastical traditions. For a time, indeed, it looked as if his own experience of the grace of God were destined to become the centre around which the entire religious, moral, intellectual, social and even political life of the period would fashion itself in the form of a new organism of civilization. Erelong, to be sure, the limitations of his genius became apparent, but this at least he had accomplished: within the domain of the

³⁵ Cf. Loofs, *Leitfaden*,⁴ pp. 696 ff. Hence Luther's statement made in 1545 (*Opp. Lat. var. arg.*, Erlangen, i, p. 22) that he did not grasp the sense of Rom. i, 17 till the time of his *second* lecturing on the Psalms (1519) is due to a slip of memory. Cf. Scheel, *Die Entwicklung, etc.*, pp. 112 ff., and Loofs, *ibid.*, pp. 688 ff. Denifle's idea that Luther adopted the new view of justification by faith about 1515 as a boon to his carnal desires—that being according to Denifle's ingenious use of the evidence the time of the monk's deepest degradation—is scarcely worthy of serious consideration (cf. Scheel, as cited, pp. 105 ff.).

³⁶ See note 32.

traditional piety he had established a generically different type of Christianity—a new view of God, man, and their relations in Christ Jesus.³⁷ And it was out of this life-transforming experience, as from a single tap-root, that Luther's characteristic views of faith, and of the Scriptures that nourished his faith, were developed.³⁸

Taking our stand, then, in the period immediately following his conversion to evangelicalism, let us ascertain some of his leading ideas concerning the Scripture, as these are reflected in his *Dictata super Psalterium* (1513-15)³⁹ and in his Lectures on Romans (1515-16).⁴⁰

We shall have occasion later, when we attempt a systematic presentation of his views on this subject to revert to these early sources. For the present it will suffice to point to a few of the characteristic utterances that show the path of future progress alike in constructive theologizing and in criticism of the traditional authorities revered in the Church.⁴¹

The true centre of the Scripture is Christ, more accu-

³⁷ On the significance of Protestantism as a generic "Weltanschauung," see the suggestive statements by A. Kuyper, *Calvinism* (The L. P. Stone Lectures for 1898-99), pp. 12 ff.

³⁸ Cf. Thimme, "Luthers Stellung zur Heiligen Schrift, ihrem Wert und ihrer Autorität," in *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, vii, 1896, p. 644.

³⁹ *Werke*, Weimar ed., iii, iv.

⁴⁰ J. Ficker, "Luthers Vorlesung über den Römerbrief, 1515-1516" in *Anfänge reformatorischer Bibelauslegung*, Vol. i, 1908. For our purpose it is not necessary to enter into the controversy as to the amount of Neo-Platonic mysticism, if any, there is in the Lectures on the Psalms or those on Romans. Scheel, *Die Entwicklung*, etc., pp. 164 ff. denies the presence of any such influence in either series of expositions, while Loofs, *Leitfaden*,⁴ pp. 692 ff., following Hunzinger (*Lutherstudien*, i, *Luthers Neuplatonismus in der Psalmvorlesung von 1513-1516*) goes the length of saying that Augustine's Neo-Platonic mysticism is the very key for the understanding of Luther's theology in these years. Ficker, as cited, makes much of the German mysticism in Luther in this period, but can see no far-reaching influence from the Neo-Platonic type of mysticism.

⁴¹ Cf. Preuss, as cited, pp. 9 ff., and Scheel, *Luthers Stellung*, etc., pp. 17 ff.

rately, Christ crucified.⁴² In the four Gospels is the whole Scripture, and they are in every Scripture.⁴³ No one should interpret the Bible according to his own desires; but should take it to the fountain, that is, the cross of Christ.⁴⁴ Therefore Christ is the centre and end of all, to whom all things look and whom they show forth.⁴⁵ Only through knowing Christ can one understand the Scripture, for he is its sun and its truth.⁴⁶ The whole Old Testament speaks of Christ.⁴⁷ Solomon, like David, had a clear knowledge of Christ.⁴⁸ What the pasture is to cattle, homes to men, nests to birds, that the sacred Scripture is to believing souls.⁴⁹ It affords them all they need.⁵⁰ It is an abundant fountain to all who thirst for wholesome teach-

⁴² *Werke*, Weim. ed., iv, p. 153, ll. 27 f.: "*Ego non intelligo usquam in Script. nisi Christum crucifixum.*" Cf. *ibid.*, iii, p. 13, ll. 2 ff.: "*Non iudicavi me scire aliquid inter vos, nisi Ihesum Christum et hunc crucifixum.*"

⁴³ *Ibid.*, iii, p. 597, ll. 31 ff.

⁴⁴ In a German sermon preached November 11, 1515 (Weimar ed., i, p. 52, ll. 15-19).

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, iii, p. 368, ll. 22 f.: "*quia est centrum omnium, quo habito omnia habentur in circumferentia et ipse in omnibus omnia adimplet.*" Cf. the Scholia on Romans (Ficker, as cited), p. 240, l. 10: "*Quod universa Scriptura de solo Christo est ubique*"; and p. 9, l. 15. Cf. the Glosses on Romans, *ibid.*, p. 4, l. 20: "*quod tota [sacra Scriptura] de Christo sit intelligenda.*"

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, iii, p. 620, ll. 18 f.: "ja das ist die rechte regel. wer all psalmen horet, gleych als auss Christus mund geredet."

⁴⁷ Cf. *ibid.*, iii, p. 319, ll. 28 ff.; p. 132, ll. 21 ff.; i, p. 219, ll. 24 ff. (1517): "das beken ich vor mich. alss oft ich weniger yn der schrifft dan Christum funden hab, byn ich nach nie sat wurden. Alss oft aber ich meer dan Christum funden hab, byn ich nie armer wurden." Of course, some of the Humanists had already seen the central significance of Christ in the Scriptures. Cf. e.g., on Erasmus, K. Müller, *Kirchengeschichte*, ii, Erster Halbband, pp. 207 ff. From him Oecolampad is said to have learned the maxim, "*Nihil in sacris litteris praeter Christum quaerendum.*" But the Humanistic conception of Christ as Savior was defective from the religious point of view and for that very reason also ethically inadequate. Cf. Scheel, *Luthers Stellung, etc.*, p. 18 (against Seeberg, as cited, p. 210).

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, iv, p. 504, ll. 19 f.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, iii, 640, ll. 31 ff.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, iii, 587, ll. 29 ff.

ing.⁵¹ Every divine Scripture is living and enduring.⁵² The chief duty of the Church is to proclaim the Word of God.⁵³ The bishops, priests and teachers of the day are guilty of preaching "*larvas opinionum et questionum et nugarum*" instead of the true seed of the Word.⁵⁴ From this seed come the children of God.⁵⁵ As living speech makes living impressions on the living hearer, so the Gospel spiritually makes spiritual impressions, spiritually living and eternal knowledge in spiritually living hearts.⁵⁶ Not to be content with the Gospel and to build up another teaching is to be guilty of tempting God.⁵⁷ The Gospel is to be heard as if we were listening to the Master present, to Christ speaking.⁵⁸ The ancient fathers were right in saying that nothing should be done, save as it conformed to the testimonies of the Scriptures and the sacred teachers.⁵⁹ The Scripture is sufficient to refute the heretics with their carnal pride.⁶⁰ In a sermon of about 1517 he speaks of three lines of argument, "ratione," "autoritate," and "similitudine," and then explains the second by saying "autoritate, teutonice mit *gesprochenen der Schrift*."⁶¹ On the basis of his better knowl-

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 406, ll. 8 f.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 342, l. 20.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 261, ll. 13 f.: "*Ecclesia . . . captiva in auctoritatem Scripturae, non docens nisi verbum dei.*" Cf. the Scholia on Romans (ed. Ficker), p. 278, ll. 6 ff.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, iii, p. 216, ll. 25 ff. Cf. i, p. 13, ll. 35 ff.: "*quae est enim dementia et tam perversa perversitas ut de bonis moribus cogites et non magis cures, quomodo hi fiant et sint quibus bonos mores paras?*"

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, iii, p. 345, ll. 13 ff. Cf. i, p. 11, l. 15; iii, p. 216, ll. 28 ff. It will be observed that Luther uses "*Scriptura*" and "*verbum Dei*" as synonymous. On occasion he does distinguish them as in i, p. 506, l. 18 f.: "*scripturam sanctam et verbum dei.*" For our present purpose it is not necessary to dwell on this fact, nor to raise the question as to the relation of the two to each other and to the Holy Spirit who works through them (or also apart from them).

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, iii, p. 457, ll. 3 ff.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, iii, p. 577, ll. 39 ff.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, iv, p. 535, l. 1 f. Cf. the Scholia on Romans (ed. Ficker), p. 243, ll. 3 ff.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, iv, p. 318, l. 1.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, iii, p. 578, ll. 5 ff.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, iv, p. 591, ll. 6 ff. Cf. iv, p. 639, ll. 17 f. (1517?): "*sed*

edge of the Scripture he even begins in a modest way to criticize some church customs and traditions, such as private confession⁶² and veneration of the saints.⁶³

As Luther had been the first doctor of theology to devote all his academic lectures to the Bible,⁶⁴ so his influence in behalf of the Scriptures soon secured their primacy in the thought and labor of his colleagues.⁶⁵ His exegetical studies were constantly turned to practical account in his ministrations in the monastery and in the parish church, and this application of the truth in turn led to his clearer perception and more perfect possession of it.⁶⁶ It was his determination to have the teaching of the Scriptures kept "pure and secure" that in due time constrained him to oppose the established ecclesiastical business of selling indulgences.⁶⁷

But before we take up the issues growing out of that memorable controversy, let us briefly notice the more or less critical attitude that Luther had already assumed before 1517 in regard to such traditional authorities as Aristotle, the Scholastics and the church fathers.

"See how aptly Aristotle in his philosophy serves theology," exclaims Luther in a Christmas sermon of 1514.⁶⁸ "This beautiful philosophy, though understood by few, is useful to the highest theology."⁶⁹ And in the realm of *requiritur quod sit contra scripturam sanctam, si debet cum auctoritate refutari.*"

⁶² *Ibid.*, iv, p. 674, ll. 20 ff. (1516?); cf. i, p. 98, l. 31 (October, 1516).

⁶³ *Ibid.*, i, p. 413, l. 19 (1518). On similar criticisms in the Glosses and Scholia on Romans, see Ficker, as cited, pp. lxxxv ff. On indulgences, see the Scholia, *ibid.*, pp. 123, 244; on relics, *ibid.*, p. 305, ll. 1 ff.: "*Item Princeps* [Frederick the Wise] *et Episcopus* [the Primate Albert of Mainz] *reliquiis emulantur sese.*"

⁶⁴ Köstlin, *Luthers Theol.*,² i, p. 42.

⁶⁵ Ficker, as cited, pp. lxxv ff. and p. lxxviii, n. 2 (an excerpt from Lang's Preface, March 1516, to Paul's Epistle to Titus, showing Lang's new attitude to the Scriptures).

⁶⁶ Cf. the Scholia on Romans, as cited, p. 272, ll. 13 ff.: "*ut et ego practice exponam Scripture sensum, ut ex similibus similia intelligatis.*"

⁶⁷ *Werke*, Erlangen, 28, p. 350.

⁶⁸ *Werke*, Weimar, i, p. 28, l. 19.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 29, l. 28.

natural science the ancient sage is favorably mentioned in the Scholia on the Romans.⁷⁰ But in the domain of ethics and theology he becomes the object of increasingly severe criticism and condemnation. He is regarded as the patron and champion of the scholastic philosophy. His ethics, indeed, are characterized as the worst foe to grace.⁷¹ The syllogistic forms which owed their currency to him are not adequate for divine terms.⁷² Already in the Marginal Notes on Augustine (about 1509) we find a reference to "*fabulator Aristoteles cum suis frivolis defensoribus*," and in the Notes on the Lombard (1510-11) we read a not more flattering characterization "*Aristotelis rancidi philosophi*,"⁷⁴ whose philosophy has brought forth many monstrous things.⁷⁵ The good elements in Aristotle are stolen possessions.⁷⁶ In the Lectures on the Psalms Luther finds fault with him for promoting a disputatious temper among the learned,⁷⁷ and for furthering the cause of Antichrist by turning his disciples away from things divine.⁷⁸ Luther especially attacks the ethical maxim of the Stagirite that we become righteous by doing the right.⁷⁹ In May, 1517, he wrote to his friend Lang, that the new theology and Augus-

⁷⁰ Ficker, as cited, p. 81, l. 16. See the Index for the many others references to Aristotle, a few of these being neutral toward him, but the great majority being hostile.

⁷¹ *Werke*, Weimar ed., i, 226, Thesis no. 41: "*Tota fere Aristotelis Ethica pessima est gratiae inimica*."

⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 226, no. 47. Cf. Dieckhoff, *Luthers Lehre in ihrer ersten Gestalt*, p. 41 f., and n. 2, where reference is made to the similar Theses of the Heidelberg Disputation (1518; *Opp. Lat. var. arg.*, Erlangen, i, p. 389).

⁷³ *Werke*, Weimar, ix, p. 23, ll. 7 ff.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 43, l. 5.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 57, l. 12. Cf. i, 612, ll. 5 ff. (1518), where Aristotle is blamed for the utter confusion into which the Scholastic theology has fallen.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, i, p. 28, l. 21.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, iii, p. 382, ll. 20 ff.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, iii, p. 423, ll. 5 ff.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, iv, p. 3, ll. 32 f. Cf. i, p. 84, ll. 19 ff.; p. 226, no. 40; p. 494, l. 21 ("*garrulitates dialecticae*"); the Scholia on Romans, as cited pp. 178, 183 *et passim*; and Scheel, *Die Entwicklung Luthers*, etc., pp. 148 f.

tine were progressing nicely at the University, and that Aristotle would soon be dethroned.⁸⁰ Certainly on the eve of the Reformation the break with this venerated "authority" of the Middle Ages was complete.⁸¹

The connection between Aristotle and the Schoolmen being what it was, Luther could not fail, with his ripening evangelicalism, to express his growing dissatisfaction with these medieval theologians. As we have seen, he classifies himself with the Nominalists, the "*moderni*," who sought to hold a course between the *via Scoti* and the *via Thomae*. He naturally praises his master Occam,⁸² but after the early Marginal Notes on Augustine and the Lombard, it is rather surprising to see how little the Schoolmen are quoted and how often they are attacked. Duns Scotus is repeatedly named, even in these Notes, with disapprobation.⁸³ The Lombard is praised on one occasion as the best of all the teachers because of his reserved handling of the question of the constitution of the angels.⁸⁴ Much later the Reformer speaks of this master with appreciation, though taking exception to his views of faith and justification as being "too thin and too weak."⁸⁵ But even in the Notes on the Lombard the author ventures to regard a particular solution offered by this schoolman as invalid because erroneous.⁸⁶ Biel too is criticized.⁸⁷

In the Lectures on the Psalter Thomas is named but once.⁸⁸ Bonaventura and Hugo of St. Victor receive more

⁸⁰ *Briefwechsel* (ed. Enders) i, p. 100, ll. 10 ff.

⁸¹ *Werke*, Weimar, i, p. 226, Thesis 44: "*Immo theologus non fit nisi id fiat sine Aristotele.*"

⁸² *Werke*, Weimar, ix, p. 33, ll. 30 f.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, ix, p. 16, ll. 7, 14; p. 24, ll. 24 f.; p. 43, ll. 22 f.; p. 62, l. 20. Cf. Scheel, *Die Entwicklung Luthers*, pp. 127 ff.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, ix, p. 62, ll. 16 ff.

⁸⁵ *Werke*, Erl., 25, p. 258 (anno 1539).

⁸⁶ *Werke*, Weimar, ix, p. 85, ll. 6 ff.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 74, ll. 8 ff.

⁸⁸ Preuss, as cited, p. 20. The passage is *ibid.*, iv, p. 207, l. 25. There can be little doubt about the validity of Denifle's statement—repeated time and again by Grisar in his biography of Luther—that the Reformer never became thoroughly acquainted with the Angelic Doctor or in-

consideration, and Bernard is favored most of all after Augustine.

In the Christmas sermon of 1514, Luther already dissociates himself from his fellow Nominalists,⁸⁹ and in the Theses of September, 1516, composed by Bernhardt and publicly discussed under Luther as the presiding officer and defended by him, there is conscious opposition to the Lombard and the Pelagianism of the Schoolmen.⁹⁰

In the Lectures on Romans the Thomists and Scotists are named but once,⁹¹ and the only Scholastics named with any frequency are the Lombard and Bernard. But as a class the "*subtiles theologi*," "*nostri theologi*," "*scolastici*," "*philosophi*," "*scolastici theologi*" "*morales*," "*logici*," "*recentiores doctores*" receive much unfavorable consideration in the Scholia, because of their anti-evangelical or unevangelical views of sin and grace.⁹²

In a letter to his friend Lang (September ? 1516) a similarly severe verdict is expressed against Biel and Scotus.⁹³ About the same time Carlstadt praises his colleague Luther as the "sharpest doctor of theology" who was wont to declare that "the Schoolmen are the greatest strangers to the teachings of Christ."⁹⁴ Scholasticism has become for Luther a "*studium vanitatis et perditionis*," with which he has done and from which he deems it his duty to dissuade men in favor of the Scriptures.⁹⁵ He has as a matter of fact

deed with any of the Schoolmen of the culminating period of Scholasticism. For a characteristic later judgment on Aquinas, see *ibid.*, viii, p. 127, ll. 19 f. (anno 1521).

⁸⁹ *Werke*, Weimar, i, p. 21, l. 38.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, i, pp. 145 ff.

⁹¹ Ficker, as cited, p. lviii.

⁹² Ficker, as cited, pp. 23 f., 55 ff., *et passim*.

⁹³ *Briefwechsel* (ed. Enders), i, p. 55, ll. 43 ff.

⁹⁴ Ficker, *op. cit.*, p. lxx, quoting Barge, *Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt*, ii, p. 534. Cf. *Werke*, Erl., 63, p. 162, where the Schoolmen are compared with Origen, "der durch die Philosophia und Vernunft die Schrift verbittert und verderbet hat." Cf. the later facetious accusation (*Werke*, Weim., i, p. 507, ll. 37 ff.): "*Scholastici enim sunt, id est ludicri et lusores, immo et illusores tam sui quam aliorum, qui neque quid sit litera neque quid spiritus cognoverunt.*"

⁹⁵ Scholia on Romans, as cited, p. 199, ll. 7 ff.

turned Nominalism against and beyond itself. In the philosophic Theses of September, 1517, he levels his shafts alike at Aristotle, Scotus, and Biel, not sparing even his beloved Occam. His dissatisfaction with these traditional church authorities was later (1519) expressed in the terse sentence: "I there had lost Christ, now in Paul I have found him."⁹⁶

Of all the fathers whom Luther consulted Augustine was by far the most important and influential. This is apparent in the earliest as well as in the latest sources of the period under consideration, *i.e.*, to 1517.⁹⁷ Many others are mentioned, but their authority is determined more and more by the amount of their agreement with Augustine and the Scriptures. The greatest of the fathers is, of course, specially useful to Luther in his conflict with the Pelagianism of the Schoolmen. In fine, it was Luther's devotion to the Psalter and to the Epistle to the Romans that gave Augustine the victory at Wittenberg to which reference has already been made. Luther has virtually outgrown Nominalism, Scotism, Thomism, and the lower Catholic elements of Augustinism.⁹⁸

As to the papal hierarchy, Luther's views before 1517—and, as we shall see, for some time thereafter—were those of a submissive and dutiful son of the Church. If on occasion he criticizes the popes, it is not their official teachings but their characters and their conduct that are aimed at.⁹⁹ In the Scholia on Romans he indulges in accusations and complaints that reveal his new consciousness as to his own

⁹⁶ *Werke*, Weim., ii, p. 414, ll. 28. At the same time he does not entirely reject the Scholastics (*ibid.*, i, p. 391 ll. 5 ff.); "nit dass ich sie gantz vorwirff, dan sie haben das yhre than." He only insists that their opinions should be supported with "schrifften und vornunft."

⁹⁷ See *Werke*, Weimar, ix, p. 29, ll. 5 f. (anno 1510-11); p. 38, ll. 28 f. ("If the blessed Augustine did not say something else, I should say"); p. 53, l. 21; Scholia on Romans, as cited (see Index).

⁹⁸ Cf. Scheel, *Die Entwicklung Luthers*, p. 181; Ficker, pp. lxxviii ff.

⁹⁹ *Werke*, Weim., iii, p. 598, l. 30 ("*superbi pontifices*"); *ibid.*, p. 235, l. 34 ("*quando ruunt etiam pontifices et sacerdotes*").

¹⁰⁰ Scholia, as cited, p. 301, ll. 19 f.: "*Meum est dicere, quaecunque videro non recta fieri, etiam in sublimioribus.*"

mission.¹⁰⁰ He is specially vigorous in his attacks on the pomp, extravagance and worldiness of the prelates and the varied abominations of the curia.¹⁰¹ He demands the abolition of some of the fast and feast days and the amendment of almost the entire *Decretum*.¹⁰² On the other hand, he still urges obedience to every word of a prelate, as if toward Christ himself.¹⁰³ There is in general a noticeable tendency to find fault with the ecclesiastical rulers and at the same time to commend the better behavior of the temporal powers.¹⁰⁴

Such was the position of rather unstable equilibrium in which Luther stood on the eve of the Reformation: free and bold in his criticism of ecclesiastical abuses, filled with a keen sense of his widening vocation for the improvement of the old order of things, or rather for the introduction of a new one, yet firmly and closely bound to the authority of the Church. His knowledge of the Scriptures was being constantly deepened and perfected,¹⁰⁵ but as yet their authority was inextricably interwoven with the influences of the age-long traditions of the papal Church. If, as we have seen, he had begun to entertain a more spiritual conception of the Church as the creation of the pure Gospel, nevertheless even as a derived authority the Church in practice was the supreme arbiter in matters of faith and conduct, capable

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 298-302; and cf. p. 319, l. 28, where it is said that at Rome "*Omnia sunt devorata per dispensationes.*"

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 317, ll. 28.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 88, ll. 10 f.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. xcvi.

¹⁰⁵ We need not dwell upon the fact that it was this knowledge of the Scriptures that delivered Luther from the danger of mystic spiritualism. Ficker, as cited, gives a careful estimate of the mysticism in Luther's Lectures on Romans both before and after Tauler's influence entered, and shows that in these very Lectures he led the German mysticism beyond itself (pp. lxxxii ff.). Cf. Loofs, *Leitfaden*,⁴ pp. 723 f., and his *Luthers Stellung z. Mittelalter u. z. Neuzeit*, p. 27, n. 1; Köstlin, *Luthers Theol.*,² i, p. 118, who rightly stresses Luther's deep sense of sin as a safeguard against the subjectivism of the mystic; Harnack, *Lehrbuch*,⁴ p. 846; and Scheel, *Die Entwicklung Luthers*, p. 201, who minimizes the influence of every type of mysticism upon Luther.

of expressing itself in infallible terms in the deliverances alike of the pope and of the councils.¹⁰⁶ As in the Lectures on the Psalms he still regarded St. Peter as the "prince of the Apostles and of the Churches,"¹⁰⁷ so in a sermon of 1516 he declared that "all the works and merits of Christ are in the hands of the pope,"¹⁰⁸ and he closed the Theses of September, 1517, "*contra scholasticam theologiam*" with the statement; "In these matters we wish to say nothing and believe we have said nothing that does not agree with the Catholic Church and the ecclesiastical teachers."¹⁰⁹

It was the controversy concerning the more celebrated Ninety-five Theses on indulgences that led Luther to a clearer discernment of the relation of the primary authority of the Scriptures to the secondary authority of the Church. A practical issue presented itself to him as a conscientious pastor that compelled him to raise the question as to how far, according to the Church's teaching, the power of the pope with respect to indulgences extended. This was his chief concern in the nailing of these Theses to the door of the Castle Church on October 31, 1517. The theory of indulgences was still an open academic question, and as one entrusted with the cure of souls and as a professor of theology he wished not only to protest in this more public way against an evil which he had already denounced in the pulpit and the class room, but also to clarify his own mind by means of a discussion by suitable representatives of the Church. But the issue thus raised soon presented a conflict of basal principles. The controversy was bound to centre in the very question that had led to Luther's conversion to evangelicalism—the question of the forgiveness of sins—and that, for the rank and file of church members, had resulted in the elaboration of that sacrament which came to occupy

¹⁰⁶ *Werke*, Weimar, i, p. 444, ll. 17 ff.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, iv, p. 169, l. 25.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, i, p. 67, ll. 31 ff.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, i, p. 228, ll. 34 ff.

the largest place in their religious life, the sacrament of penance.¹¹⁰

The Theses themselves—the cry of an oppressed conscience that was destined soon to be heard throughout Germany and all Europe—present inconsistencies of the sort that quite naturally characterize a transition like that which Luther was making from the fetters of tradition to the freedom of evangelical faith. It is significant for our purpose that while he makes no attack upon the pope or the Roman Church,¹¹¹ or even her doctrines, he nowhere regards the prevalent theology as a genuine authority or even supports himself by its teachings.

The first Thesis strikes the keynote of the series: "Our Lord and Master Jesus Christ in saying, 'Repent ye, etc.,' intended that the whole life of the Christian should be penitence." The most advanced positions are those taken in Theses 36, 37, and 62; "Every Christian who feels true compunction duly has plenary remission of pain and guilt, even without letters of pardon"; "Every true Christian, whether living or dead, partakes of all the benefits of Christ and of the Church given him by God, even without letters of pardon"; "The true treasure of the Church is the holy Gospel of the glory and the grace of God."¹¹² These decla-

¹¹⁰ Kolde, *Luthers Stellung zu Concil und Kirche*, p. vii, et passim, insists that the "cardinal" issue between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism is an ecclesiological one. Certainly the differences can be conveniently set forth in ecclesiological terms. But after all the constitution of the Church, in the one case as in the other, is but an outer expression of fundamental religious and theological principles. The two systems are generically different organisms and therefore any vital element of either may be said, when contrasted with the corresponding member of the other, to have a "cardinal" importance. Cf. Harnack's suggestive series of formulas each one of which may be said to be capable of holding Luther's Christianity as a whole; *Lehrbuch*,⁴ iii, pp. 834-847.

¹¹¹ Cf. Thesis No. 9 (*Werke*. Weimar, i, p. 233, ll. 17 f.: "*Inde bene nobis facit spiritussanctus in papa. . .*"; and Thesis 7: "*Nulli prorsus remittit deus culpam, quin simul eum subiiciat humiliatum in omnibus sacerdoti suo vicario.*"

¹¹² *Ibid.* On the theological import of the Theses, see Köstlin, *Luthers Theol.*,² pp. 159-170.

rations contain the germinal ideas of the new faith, and though some of the Theses are more Catholic than evangelical, nevertheless they implicitly, if not explicitly, call into question the power of the pope.¹¹³ No wonder the sharp-eyed Eck complained of their "*irreverentia*" with respect to the pontiff.

Indeed the whole course of the immediately following controversy showed that Rome¹¹⁴ early and clearly saw the scope of the issue; nothing less than the papal authority itself was at stake. We can only briefly glance at the first stages of the conflict.

Tetzel, the Dominican monk whose scandalous peddling of the jubilee indulgence of 1514 had brought matters to a crisis in Wittenberg, issued two series of counter-theses, composed for him by Prof. Wimpina of the University of Frankfort-on-the-Oder: one attacking Luther's views on indulgences (Theses 1-106); and the other (Theses 1-50) specifically taking up the main question—that of the "*potes-tas Papae*." These latter propositions set forth the traditional curialism in the boldest and most arrogant way. "Christians are to be taught why the power of the pope is supreme in the Church, and instituted solely by God, (and) that it can be restricted or enlarged by no mere man, nor by the whole world together, but only by God" (Th. 1); that he is superior to the whole Church and to a council, and that his decrees are to be humbly obeyed (Th. 3); that he alone determines matters of faith, and himself authoritatively interprets the sense of Scripture, and that it is his business to approve or disapprove all words and works of others (Th. 4); "that the judgment of the pope, in matters that pertain to faith and are necessary to human welfare,

¹¹³ Cf. Th. 91, in which he presumes to ascribe his own more evangelical ideas on indulgences to the pope himself: "*Si ergo venie secundum spiritum et mentem Pape predicarentur, facile illa omnia solverentur, immo non essent.*" See also Theses 20, 42, 74.

¹¹⁴ See the letter to Pope Leo by Silvester Prierias, prefixed to his *Dialogus* against Luther's Theses, in Löscher, *Vollständige Reformation-Acta*, ii, p. 13.

can by no means err" (Th. 5) or at least it does not happen that he himself errs in affirming a judgment concerning such matters (Th. 6); that the Church holds many things as Catholic truths, which are not contained in the canonical Scriptures in the proper form of the words (Th. 16) nor in the ancient Fathers (Th. 17); that all are heretics who try to take away from the Roman Church the privilege delivered to her by the supreme head of all the churches (Th. 26); that all ought to follow the Roman Church as their teacher (Th. 27); that the "assertions of teachers that lead the people to a schism, like the proposition that a bad prelate or prince is not to be obeyed, or that the pope and his bulls are not to be believed, are altogether seditious" (Th. 33).¹¹⁵

Early in 1518,¹¹⁶ Luther wrote a letter to his superior, Scultetus, the Bishop of Brandenburg, which is interesting from our point of view for several reasons. It shows, for example, how reluctant he still is to question the authority of the Church in the issue he has himself forced upon the public.¹¹⁷ Again, he here groups together "*Scripturas*," "*doctores ecclesiasticos*," and "*ipsos canones*" as the authorities which he is willing to acknowledge in his handling of

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, i, pp. 518 ff. Cf. Kolde, as cited, p. 15, who rightly says that Luther, in the judgment of his foes, was a heretic, not so much because he had a different idea about indulgences from that of the curia, but "because he ventured to have an opinion at all, where according to those infallibilists he was by no means entitled to have one."

¹¹⁶ Kolde, *op. cit.*, p. 17, and Undritz, *op. cit.*, p. 578, follow the traditional date of this letter, May 22, 1518. But it must have been written considerably before March 5, for reasons given by Enders, *op. cit.*, p. 151, n. 1. The Weimar editor dates it Feb. 6, Enders Feb. 13. As Scheel, *Luthers Stellung, etc.*, p. 27, shows, the considerations that Undritz (p. 577) brings forward in regard to Luther's postponing the main question as to the pope's power fall to the ground by reason of this error in the dating of the letter.

¹¹⁷ Enders, as cited, i, p. 149, ll. 23 ff.: "*visum est id optimum consilium . . . interim de tanta re disputare, donec ecclesia sancta statueret, quid sentiendum foret.*" Cf. the statement in a letter to Egranus, early in April of the same year (*ibid.*, p. 182, ll. 4 ff.): "*Primum placet, quod omnia sub iudicium ecclesiae, imprimis Ordinarii tui (ut dicitur) submittis.*" On the slowness with which Luther framed his new ideas of the Church, cf. Kolde, as cited, p. 26.

the evils connected with the indulgence business.¹¹⁸ The canonists who talk without a text and the scholastic teachers who hold similar opinions but offer no proofs are not worthy of consideration: indeed, if it is a disgrace for a jurist to speak without a text, it is a much greater one for a theologian to do so, that is to speak, not without the text of Aristotle—him they quote altogether too much—"but without our text, that is, the text of sacred Scripture, and the ecclesiastical canons, and the Fathers."¹¹⁹ This trio of "authorities" is maintained for some time—the *Asterisci* give several instances of the combination—but more and more it is the Scriptures that are emphasized. In his letter to Trutvetter (May 9, 1518) he expresses the conviction that the Church cannot be reformed unless "the canons, decretals, scholastic theology, philosophy, logic, as now held, be completely rooted out and other studies instituted; . . . that the purest studies of the Bible and the holy fathers be brought back once more."¹²⁰

It was probably early in January, 1518, that Luther received Silvester Prierias' *Dialogus . . . in praesumptuosas M. Lutheri conclusiones de potestate Papae*.¹²¹ The author's standpoint is that of Tetzel-Wimpina. He builds his papal absolutism upon four "*fundamenta*." Of these the first declared that "the universal Church virtually is the Roman Church, the head of all the churches, and the Pontifex maximus." Representatively it is the college of cardinals, but virtually it is the pope. The second axiom is that just as the universal Church cannot err in determining a matter of faith or morals, so also a true council cannot err ("*incluso capite*"), nor can the pontiff when he speaks "*ex officio suo*" for the ascertainment of the truth. The third foundation was to the effect that "whosoever does not stand on the teaching of the Roman Church and of the pope, as the in-

¹¹⁸ Enders, i, p. 149 ll. 28 f.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, ll. 30 ff, 41 ff.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, i, p. 189, ll. 45 ff.

¹²¹ It may be found in Löschner, as cited, ii, pp. 12-40, and in the Erlangen edition, *Opp. Lat. var. arg.*, 344-377.

fallible rule of faith, from which even the sacred Scripture draws its force and authority [*"robur trahit et auctoritatem"*] is a heretic." In the fourth of these "norms" Silvester affirms that the Roman Church can determine matters of faith and morals by deeds as well as by words, and that therefore he who thinks evil of the teaching and deeds of the Church is a heretic as much as he who thinks evil of the truth of the Scriptures.

So daring an assertion of the papal prerogatives made Luther at first regard the work as spurious. Necessarily it constrained him to investigate more thoroughly than ever not only the content of the Christian faith but also the reasons for accepting it.¹²² We shall have to return to this treatise when we consider Luther's reply.

It has well been said that while Luther's radical friends exerted for the most part a restraining influence upon him, his most reckless foes spurred him on.¹²³ This *Dialogus* furnishes one illustration of this fact. Another may be found in Luther's *Asterisci*, finished some time in March, 1518, and privately circulated in manuscript form.¹²⁴ They were composed as a refutation of Eck's *Obelisci*. Significant is the initial statement that in the whole chaos of Eck's assertions there is "nothing of the sacred letters, nothing of the ecclesiastical fathers, nothing of the canons"—the same trio of still recognized authorities which we found in the letter to Bishop Scultetus—but "*omnia scholasticissima, opiniosissima meraque somnia*" are mixed together.¹²⁵ Christ is on the side of the "ecclesiastici"—the acknowledged church teachers—while the "scholastici" can take refuge only in Aristotle.¹²⁶ Their deliverances are of no account for Luther save as they are supported by the church

¹²² Cf. Dorner, *History of Prot. Theol.* i, p. 90.

¹²³ Undritz, as cited, p. 582, Kolde, as cited, p. 55.

¹²⁴ The editor of the Weimar edition (i, p. 279) claims that the *Asterisci* went to press for the first time when the first collection of Luther's works was published at Wittenberg in 1545.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 281, ll. 29 ff.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 313, ll. 16.

doctrines.¹²⁷ More important is the accusation that the Schoolmen "defile" the Scriptures.¹²⁸ But boldest of all is the assertion that "the pope is a man and can err,"¹²⁹ and that a council is superior to the pope.¹³⁰

At the Disputation, held in Heidelberg on April 26, 1518, under Luther's presidency, on the occasion of a regular chapter meeting of the Augustinian monks, the Theses discussed were essentially his work. They reflect his fervent evangelical faith, in contrast with the flat moralism of the Aristotelian ethics and the Scholastic Pelagianism.¹³¹ We refer to this debate only because of the additional evidence it gives us that the Reformer's development was being shaped more and more by his devotion to the Scriptures and the early fathers. In the introduction to the Theses Luther declares it as his purpose to draw his statements "from the divine Paul, the choicest vessel and organ of Christ, and then from St. Augustine, his most faithful interpreter."¹³² And it was this fidelity to Scripture and the fathers that especially impressed one of the youthful hearers, Martin Butzer, who was won to the evangelical cause on that occa-

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, i, p. 285, ll. 33 f. We here follow Preuss, as cited, p. 34, who gives many further references to this effect.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, i, p. 305, ll. 3 ff. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 286, ll. 31 f.: "*Sic enim non Scholastici, sed Ecclesiastici, imo coelestis Paulus loquitur.*"

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, i, p. 306, ll. 14 f., with the characteristic addition: "*Sed veritas est Deus, qui falli non potest.*"

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, i, p. 308, ll. 25 f.: "*Aliud est, Papam narrare, aliud statuere, Imo longe aliud Papam statuere, et Concilium approbare.*" Here then is a virtual rejection of a genuine Extravagant—that of Clement VI (1342-52) on indulgences. Luther disregarded the papal teaching because it had never been "approved" by a council (see the context). Cf. his assertion of a few months later: "Darumb wan ess die kirch beschleusst, sso wil ich glauben, das das ablas seelen erlosso" (*ibid.*, i, p. 390, ll. 15 f.; "Eyn Freyheydt des Sermons Bebstlichen Ablass und gnad belangend," June, 1518). How "the church" is to determine the matter—by what form of council—Luther does not say. He is not yet clear on that point.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 350-374. Cf. Loofs, *Leitfaden*,⁴ p. 720 f.

¹³² *Ibid.*, i, p. 353, ll. 12 ff.

sion.¹³³ Aristotle, the Schoolmen, the canons and decretals have become negligible quantities.

To his lengthy *Resolutiones* on the Ninety-five Theses—finished in May, but not completely published till August, 1518—Luther prefixed a “Protestation,” which reflects his characteristic vacillations during the summer and fall of this year. He declares that he “will assert or hold nothing but what is and can be held, in the first instance, in and by the sacred Scriptures, then by the ecclesiastical fathers received by the Roman Church and still accepted, and the canons and decretals of the popes.” At the same time he indicates his willingness still to submit to the decisions of his superiors, while he reserves the right of rejecting the mere opinions of Thomas, Bonaventura, or other Scholastics and canonists that have no “text or proof,” or accepting them upon the basis of the Pauline advice, “prove all things.”¹³⁴ In the Resolutions themselves the Scriptures are constantly used to validate his arguments, and are frequently represented as his only authority. At other times they are found in combination with the fathers or the canons or both.¹³⁵ It is interesting to see how he labors to bring the latter into harmony with his understanding of the Scriptures. The fathers derive their authority from the latter.¹³⁶ Canon laws, too, have limitations as to times, places, and persons, while the Scriptures are above such considerations.¹³⁷ Luther’s position, therefore, is still an illogical and inconsistent

¹³³ See his account of the Disputation, in the form of a letter to Beatus Rhenanus, *ibid.*, ix, pp. 161, ll. 32 ff.; 162, ll. 1 ff.; 163, ll. 24 ff., 39 ff.; 168, ll. 33 ff.; 169, l. 1.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, i, pp. 529 f. Kolde, as cited, p. 21, n. 1, uses this passage to buttress his statement: “Man sieht wie falsch es ist, das sogenannte Schriftprincip zu sehr zu urgieren; as ist vielmehr im letzten Grunde die Subjectivität das Entscheidende, wenn auch zugegeben werden muss, dass sie in der Schrift wurzelt.” But this concessive clause is only an understatement of the most important fact in regard to Luther’s relation to his “authorities” at that time: there was a growing appreciation of the principal significance of the Scriptures.

¹³⁵ Cf. Preuss, as cited, p. 40, notes 12, 13, 15, 16.

¹³⁶ *Werke*, as cited, i, p. 563, ll. 18 f.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 545, ll. 19 ff.

one. For if the Scriptures are the highest authority, why, to go no further, should the fathers and the canonical laws not suffer the same fate as the repudiated Scholastics?¹³⁸

The Resolutions throw further light on the Reformer's attitude to the pope. What pleases or displeases the pontiff is no concern to Luther: "he is a man like the rest."¹³⁹ The "keys" are not his—they are granted to every Christian for comfort and salvation. The pope, Luther says, "is my servant and minister in the keys; he himself as pope does not need them, but I do."¹⁴⁰ To say that the pope is to be entrusted with the material as well as the spiritual sword is "a gloss worthy of Tartarus."¹⁴¹ The pope cannot determine new articles of faith; only a council can do that: he can merely judge or rescind according to what has been decided.¹⁴² There is a difference to be made between the pope as such and as a man. Leo X is personally worthy of ruling in better times,¹⁴³ but some of his predecessors have been guilty "not only of errors and vices but also of monstrous things."¹⁴⁴ The pope is to be obeyed, "not on account of the statement: 'and whatsoever thou shall bind,' but on account of that general precept: 'Agree with thine adversary in the way,' and that other: 'whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also,' and Rom. xii: 'Avenge not yourselves.'"¹⁴⁵ Luther even ventures to interpret the pope to suit himself.¹⁴⁶ Most striking is the declaration that was destined, under challenge by his foes, to push him toward the final break with the papacy; namely, that even at

¹³⁸ Cf. Schenkel, *Das Wesen des Protestantism*, i, p. 22.

¹³⁹ *Werke*, as cited, i, p. 582, ll. 19 ff.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, i, p. 596, ll. 31 ff.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, i, p. 624, l. 25.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, i, p. 582, ll. 38 f. Cf. p. 583, ll. 5 ff.; p. 568, ll. 19 ff.; p. 579, l. 34, and above, n. 130.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, i, 573, l. 18.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, i, p. 582, ll. 20 f.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, i, p. 619, ll. 4 ff.

¹⁴⁶ Preuss, *op. cit.*, p. 46, n. 10, instances the following: "*mens Papae est*" (i, p. 604, l. 15); "*mens Pontificis non potest esse alia quam*" (p. 628, l. 15); "*neque mens Papae est* (p. 571, l. 37); "*ipse stilus Papae idem probat*" (p. 575, l. 18).

the time of Gregory the Great, the Roman Church did not stand over the other churches, at least not those of Greece.¹⁴⁷

The Resolutions, then, place the council above the pope. They even declare that the reformation of the Church "is not a matter for a single person, the pope, nor for the many cardinals, but for the whole world, rather for God alone."¹⁴⁸ On the other hand, in the extremely submissive letter¹⁴⁹ to Leo X prefixed to the Resolutions, he is prepared to hear in the voice of the pope the voice of Christ. Doubtless the true explanation for the inconsistencies between the dedicatory letter and the Resolutions themselves is that given by Löscher, namely, that Luther still cherished the hope that the acknowledged head of the Church would come to the conclusion that the writer could regard as the only proper one in the premises.¹⁵⁰ Taking the whole work together, then, we find that the pope, the council, and the Scripture each in turn is supreme.¹⁵¹ Such a conflict of authorities could not long endure.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, i, p. 571, ll. 17 ff. Cf. Köstlin, *Luthers Theol.*,² i, p. 225, on Luther's earlier knowledge of this as seen in the Lectures on the Psalms (*Werke*, Weim., iv, p. 345, l. 23).

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, i, p. 627, ll. 27 ff.

¹⁴⁹ The letter closes (*ibid.*, i, p. 529, ll. 23 ff.): "*Quare, Beatissime Pater, prostratum me pedibus tuae Beatitudinis offero cum omnibus, quae sum et habeo. Vivifica, occide, voca, revoca, approba, reproba, ut placuerit: vocem tuam vocem Christi in te praesidentis et loquentis agnoscam. Si mortem merui, mori non recusabo.*"

¹⁵⁰ *Op. cit.*, ii, pp. 178 f. Kolde, as cited, p. 19, misrepresents Löscher by saying that, according to him, the motive that prompted Luther's humble missive was fear, due to the reception, in the mean time, of a threatening letter from his superior, the bishop of Brandenburg. Löscher does, indeed, admit that such a letter may have been received, but adds that Luther hoped for a happy issue of his case in view of the reputed fairness of Leo X.

¹⁵¹ Cf. the significant restriction on the council's authority (*Werke*, as cited, i, p. 608, ll. 22 ff.): "*quia nullis . . . scripturis id probari nec rationibus ostendi potest, Nec ipsi, qui hoc tenent, probant, sed simpliciter narrant, ut omnibus notum est. Dixi autem prius, quod in ecclesia aliquid asserere, cuius nulla potest ratio vel auctoritas reddi, est ecclesiam hostibus et haereticis irrisioni exponere. . . .*" On the common meaning of "ratio" as the equivalent of "logical inferences," and therefore not to be taken as a separate source of knowledge and au-

In the next treatise we shall examine, "Eyn Freyheydt des Sermons Bepstlichen Ablas und gnad belangend,"—completed in June and printed for the second time in July, 1518—we have what appears to be the first clear expression of the principle of the supremacy of the Scripture. The Scripture is placed not only above all church teachers,¹⁵² but also above all popes: "Die seelen aber seyn nit mehr auff der erden, und wie woll ettlich sich understanden, dem Bapst zu schmeychlen, dissen spruch auch under die erden zuziehen, sso seyns doch gottis wort und sso offenbar, das sie noch blieben seyn und bleyben werden, dann sie seyn nit alleyn ubir sanct Peter und Pael und alle bebeste, sundernn auch ubir alle engel. . . ." ¹⁵³ But we need to be on our guard against cherishing a too high estimate of this hastily written and rhetorically colored apology.¹⁵⁴ For only a few pages before this passage the author speaks of the power of a common council finally to determine the truth that is spoken

thority, see Undritz, as cited, p. 584, and especially Preuss, as cited, pp. 15 f., 28, 39, 56, 98.

¹⁵² We quote this pointed sentence (*Werke*, Weim., i, pp. 384 f.): "Wan schon sso vil und noch mehr tausent, und sie alle heyliche lerer, hetten diss ader das gehalten, sso gelten sie doch nichts gegen eym eynigen spruch der heylichen schrift. . . . Wan nu die selben lerer hetten gleych gesagt (das sie doch nit thun), das die puss, yn Christus Worten gepoten, wurd durch das ablass abgelegt, sso solt man yhn gar nichts glauben, darumb das die schrift spricht: gottis wort mag niemant ablegen ader wandelen."

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, i, p. 390, ll. 24 ff.

¹⁵⁴ Undritz, as cited, p. 584, is quite sure that one of Carlstadt's Theses influenced Luther in this bold assertion of the supremacy of the Scriptures. The Thesis in question (see Löscher, as cited, p. 80) is no. xii in the series: "*textus Bibliae non modo uni, pluribusve ecclesiae doctoribus, sed etiam totius ecclesiae auctoritati, praefertur*" (with references to Augustine). But there is no proof of any such indebtedness, and as Seeberg reminds us (*op. cit.*, ii, p. 277, n. 1), this idea was widely current in the later Middle Ages. Cf. also Scheel, *Luthers Stellung, etc.*, p. 27, and Preuss, as cited, p. 47, n. 8, who with much reason asks why, if Luther followed Carlstadt in this particular, he did not at this time also adopt the latter's more advanced views as to the supremacy of the Scriptures over the general council (see Löscher, as cited, p. 80, Theses xvii and xx).

without the Scripture.¹⁵⁵ His vigorous language is due doubtless to his wrath over the arrogant tone of Tetzels most recent blast against him.¹⁵⁶

Among the further evidences that Luther was giving serious attention, during the summer of 1518, to the question of the authority of the pope and of the Church is the fact that he preached a sermon—probably on May 16th¹⁵⁷—on the subject of excommunication. The occasion for the discourse was the liability to this ecclesiastical punishment which many of his parishioners incurred by their disregard of the indulgences.¹⁵⁸ When some over-zealous friends or foes circulated portions of his remarks in garbled form, he published during the last days of August a Latin edition of the sermon, so far as he could recall it, in which he softened some of the severest expressions he had used in addressing the people. Nevertheless, in this work another tradition of the Church is set aside: the author boldly declares that excommunication cannot of itself deprive one of salvation. He teaches that there is a double communion of the faithful, one internal and spiritual, and the other external and corporal. The latter is a participation in the sacraments, and from this privilege the Church can exclude her members. But the former, based upon one faith, one hope, one love to God, no creature can give or take away; one forfeits it only by his own sin.¹⁵⁹

On the 7th of August Luther received a citation to appear

¹⁵⁵ *Werke*, as cited, i, p. 384, ll. 27 ff. Cf. the passage already referred to in note 130 (i, p. 390, ll. 15).

¹⁵⁶ Löschner, as cited, i, p. 484 ff.

¹⁵⁷ The date assigned by Knaake, in the Weimar edition of Luther's works (i, p. 634), following Köstlin, *M. Luther*,⁴ p. 211.

¹⁵⁸ Enders, as cited, i, p. 224. Kolde, *op. cit.*, p. 28, is probably correct in surmising that Luther preached on this subject for the further reason that he wished to clarify his own views.

¹⁵⁹ *Werke, Weimar*, i, p. 639, ll. 2 ff. The views bear a close resemblance to those of Huss, in his *De Ecclesia*; see the English translation by Dr. D. S. Schaff, especially p. 268: "For mortal sin alone divides or separates from communion of this kind, just as it separates from God himself." But Luther was not familiar with this treatise till the next year; cf. *Briefe* (ed. deWette), i, p. 341.

in Rome. The sermon we have just mentioned was a part of his answer to this summons. Another reply, more comprehensive and bolder, was his *Ad Dialogum Silvestri Prieratis de potestate papae Responsio*, published the same August. We have already become acquainted with the principles of the papal absolutism championed by Prierias.¹⁶⁰ At first sight, indeed, the Response seems to fall short of the advanced positions taken in regard to the supremacy of the Scriptures in the treatise *Eyn Freyheyt des Sermons*. For we frequently find the fathers and the canons placed alongside of the Scriptures.¹⁶¹ At the very beginning, however, the author, ignoring the four "fundamenta" of his opponent, sets up three principles of his own:¹⁶² (1) the words of Paul, "prove all things," I Thess. v. 21, and "If an angel of heaven should preach to you anything other than what ye received, let him be anathema," Gal. i. 8; (2) the word of Augustine to Jerome: "I have learned to yield this honor only to the canonical books of Scripture, that I may most firmly believe that no author among them has erred. But as to all other authors, no matter how great they may be in learning or sanctity, I do not accept their teaching as true simply because they so thought";¹⁶³ and (3) sellers of indulgences must (according to a statement of the canon law) abide by their instructions. While therefore the Scriptures, the fathers—as represented by Augustine—and the canons are here seemingly coordinated in importance, we may yet infer a virtual supremacy for the first named, not only from the well known fact that Augustine is placed highest among the fathers for the very reason that he is the best interpreter of the Scriptures, but also from the explicit statement¹⁶⁴ that Paul is his "first foundation."

¹⁶⁰ Pp. 578 f.

¹⁶¹ Preuss, as cited, p. 42, notes 2, 3.

¹⁶² *Werke*, Weimar, i, p. 647, ll. 18 ff.

¹⁶³ Luther quotes the passage freely; see *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, First Series* (ed. Ph. Schaff) i, p. 350b.

¹⁶⁴ *Werke*, Weim., i, p. 662, l. 23. Cf. the reference (*ibid.*, i, p. 648, l. 2) to the already familiar "*proverbium . . . 'Turpe est Iuristam loqui*

The *Responsio*, however, marks real progress in his solution of the question of ecclesiastical authority. It is true, Luther practically allows Prierias' "third foundation" to stand; namely, that the Scripture draws its force and authority from the teaching of the Roman Church and the pope, as the infallible rule of faith; for he is still of the opinion, and thanks Christ for the fact, that this Church has never yet departed from the faith.¹⁶⁵ But the other claims of his antagonist are set aside as being "without Scripture and authority."¹⁶⁶ If the papal champion sees the Church in the pontiff and his cardinals, Luther sees it "virtually" only in Christ and "representatively" only in a council.¹⁶⁷ And not only so, but the pope as well as the council can err ("*tam Papa quam concilium potest errare*").¹⁶⁸ So far as the fallibility of the pope is concerned, this assertion is no novelty: we have already come across it in the *Asterisci*.¹⁶⁹ But in the passage before us it is buttressed with the authority of the canon "significasti" of Tudesco of Palermo, here for the first time cited, but frequently to be used in the future.¹⁷⁰ And new also is the assertion of the infallibility of the council as well as of the pope. There is therefore an inconsistency in the author's statement that even a council can err, and his acknowledgment that the Church is to be found representatively only in *sine textu*" and the corresponding need of theologians to honor the text of Scripture (see above, n. 119).

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, ll. 25.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 656, ll. 33 ff.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, ll. 36.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, l. 32.

¹⁶⁹ See note 119.

¹⁷⁰ The canon is given by Kolde, as cited, p. 5: "*In concernentibus fidem concilium est supra papam; unde non potest papa disponere contra dispositum per concilium . . . puto tamen, quod si papa moveretur melioribus rationibus et auctoritatibus, quam concilium, quod standum esset sententiae suae. Nam et concilium potest errare . . . in concernentibus fidem etiam dictum unius privati esset praeferendum dicto papae, si ille moveretur melioribus rationibus novi et veteris testamenti, quam papa, etc.*" Cf. what Kolde says (*ibid.*) of other representatives, in the later Middle Ages, of the theory of the fallibility of popes and councils.

a council. To be sure he has not yet said that any council has erred, and doubtless his hope still is that a council, in acting upon his case, would not depart from the true faith, any more than one ever did, according to him, do so in the past. Finally, Prierias' "fourth foundation," that the deed as well as the word of the Church is binding, is rejected, if by the term "Church" is meant the curia; "for such a church," Luther repeats, "can err." Then he adds: "But the universal Church cannot err," and appeals to d'Ailly.¹⁷¹ How the universal Church can express its infallible verdict, we are not informed.¹⁷²

While therefore this *Responsio* does not furnish a further positive development of the principle of the authority of the Scriptures, it may be said to mark an advance in a negative way, by challenging more boldly the conflicting authorities of the pope and the council.¹⁷³ But the vacillations of the early summer are by no means removed. In some respects the attitude of the Reformer is even more inconsistent than it was. He has said that the pope and the council can err; virtually, he has asserted that the pope has erred; and he has taken the position that the well grounded opinion of a private person is superior to the judgment of the pope, if the former is moved by better biblical considerations.¹⁷⁴ At the same time, however, he professes to honor the power of the pope "as is proper."¹⁷⁵

At the Diet of Augsburg, Elector Frederick the Wise,

¹⁷¹ *Werke*, Weimar ed., i, p. 685, l. 21. Kropatscheck, as cited, pp. 64 ff., brings out the similarities (and differences) between Occam's and Luther's views as to the infallibility of the Scriptures and the fallibility of the pope and councils, and the infallibility of the "*ecclesia universalis*."

¹⁷² The meaning doubtless is that the trustworthiness of the universal Church is guaranteed by such divine assurances as "the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it," and that therefore some true believers will ever be found in its membership—enough to preserve the truth in its purity; cf. Kolde, as cited, p. 28, n. 1.

¹⁷³ Cf. Undritz, as cited, p. 585.

¹⁷⁴ See above, in connection with notes 129, 168, 130, 170.

¹⁷⁵ "sicut decet" (*Werke*, Weim., i, p. 670, ll. 3 ff.—an elastic enough saving clause.

Luther's sovereign, secured for the Reformer the privilege of a hearing before the papal legate Cajetan. The interviews took place in the same imperial city, October 12-14. Our chief source of information in regard to them is the account—the *Acta Augustana*—published by Luther early in December, 1518.¹⁷⁶

The legate, an ardent curialist, at once demanded, upon the basis of an Extravagant by Clement VI ("Unigenitus"), the revocation of the statement Luther made in the Fifty-eighth Thesis of October 31, 1517, to the effect that the merits of Christ are not the treasury of indulgences. But Luther rejected this Extravagant and a similar one by Sixtus IV, on the ground that they misused the Scriptures,¹⁷⁷ which he preferred to the decretals. He further denied the claim of the legate, that the pope is superior to the council, to the Scriptures, and to the whole Church, and commended the recent appeal of the Sorbonne from the pope to a council.¹⁷⁸

On the second day, in the presence of four imperial senators, a notary and witnesses, Luther read a formal "protestation"¹⁷⁹ to the legate, in which he acknowledges that he cherishes and follows the Roman Church in all his words and deeds; that he is not conscious of having said anything against "the sacred Scripture, the ecclesiastical fathers, or the decretals of the popes,¹⁸⁰ or right reason"; nevertheless, being a man and liable to err, he is ready to submit to the judgment of the Church, "to all who know better," and specifically to the Universities of Basel, Freiburg, Louvain, or Paris.

¹⁷⁶ *Werke*, Weimar, ii, pp. 6-26.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 7 and 8.

¹⁷⁸ The appeal was made March 27, 1517. For the text see Löscher, as cited, i, pp. 554 ff.

¹⁷⁹ *Werke*, Weimar, ii, pp. 8 f.

¹⁸⁰ In view of the repudiation of the two Extravagants just named, he must mean only the decretals that are in harmony with the Scriptures. But as Kolde well says (p. 31, n. 2) this is rather sophistical, for his opponents would scarcely understand him in this sense.

On the third day Luther delivered a letter¹⁸¹ to the legate in defence of himself. In this he clearly puts the Scriptures above the papal decretals. These he calls "mere words." They often err, he maintains, and need correction by later ones.¹⁸² They ought to be tested by the Scriptures.¹⁸³ He also calls to his aid Augustine and Panormitanus with the canon "Significasti," which, as we have seen, puts every believer, supported by better authority, over the pope himself.¹⁸⁴ He is ready to recant, if any one can convince him of error; but he feels it to be his duty to stand by his statements, that they may not seem to be opposed to the canons.¹⁸⁵

At Nuremberg, on his return trip, he saw a papal breve to Cajetan, in which he was treated as a convicted heretic.¹⁸⁶ This accounts, in part at least, for Luther's bolder statements in the Appendix to the *Acta*, which he added late in October or early in November.¹⁸⁷ He here declares that the truth is mistress even over the pope, and that he will not wait for the human judgment, since he already knows the divine one.¹⁸⁸ His chief concern is the pure knowledge of

¹⁸¹ *Werke*, as above, ii, pp. 9-17.

¹⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 10, ll. 18 f.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, ll. 10 ff.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, ll. 19 ff. For the canon itself see note 170. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 11, l. 2: "*cum Papa non super, sed sub verbo dei sit iuxta Gal. i [8].*"

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 12, ll. 32 f.

¹⁸⁶ The breve, of the 23rd of August, is embodied in the *Acta Augustana* (*ibid.*, pp. 23-25).

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 17-22.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 18, ll. 2 f. Cf. Kolde, as cited, p. 35, who remarks that these statements look almost like an attempt to excuse his appeal to the pope which he had drawn up in due form October 16, 1518. In this appeal (*Werke*, ii, pp. 28-33) he uses the same—doubtless the technically proper—forms of devout submission which we have already seen him use in his first letter to Leo X (accompanying his *Resolutiones* on indulgences); see above n. 149. No doubt the appeal was due to the advice of his friends and to his own wish to make a last endeavor for peace with the Church. Kolde infers from a letter written by Luther to Carlstadt on October 14 (deWette i, p. 160), "Aber mir wird gemacht ein Appellation," that the document may not have been prepared by him at all. It is certain, at any rate, that even before his interview with Cajetan he had determined to appeal to a council; see the letter of October 10 to Spalatin in Enders, as cited, i, p. 242, ll. 87 ff.

the Scriptures, which the "so-called holy decretals," if they do not corrupt, at least darken by their distorted words.¹⁸⁹ He gives an example of the perverted papal exegesis in the case of the canon on the "transferred priesthood,"¹⁹⁰ by which the Church teaches the transmission of the Mosaic priesthood from Moses to Christ, and from him to Peter and to his followers. Most important of all is the denial of the divine right of the papal supremacy. Not only does his more spiritual conception of the Church, as taught by Luke xvii. 19f.¹⁹¹ strike at the very heart of Romanism, but reverting to Matt. xvi. 18 ff., he denies that the Roman Church was placed over all others in the world.¹⁹² If the pope's supremacy were of divine right, and no one could be saved except by being under his authority, then the Christians of the whole Orient and of Africa for upwards of eight hundred years would be cast out. As for Gregory the Great, he repudiated the title of "universal bishop."¹⁹³ The monarchy of the pope, if it is to be proved at all, can rest only on such a statement as that in Romans xiii.[1]: "Every power is from God; the powers that be are ordained of God." In short, if the "monstrous" claims of the pope were allowed, Scripture and the Church would perish and nothing but the word of man would remain.¹⁹⁴

In a lengthy letter to Frederick the Wise, of November 19, 1518, Luther defends himself in view of the unfavorable issue of the Augsburg conference. He here emphasizes that it is a matter of conscience with him not to recant until he is convinced of his error by the Scriptures; but Cajetan, he insists, gave him not a single scriptural proof.¹⁹⁵

Luther had nothing more to hope for from the pope. His

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, ii, p. 18, ll. 18 ff.

¹⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, ii, p. 19, ll. 2 ff.

¹⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 20, ll. 4 ff.

¹⁹² *Ibid.*, pp. 19 f.

¹⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 20, ll. 6 ff. Cf. the statement concerning Gregory the Great in the *Resolutiones*, *ibid.*, i, p. 571, ll. 17 ff., and above in connection with n. 147.

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, ii, p. 22, ll. 19 ff.

¹⁹⁵ Enders, as cited, i, p. 286, ll. 86 ff.

appeal to the pontiff was answered, as it were, by a bull of November 9th, 1518, in which the traditional views of indulgences were sanctioned, and all opponents threatened with excommunication.

Accordingly, on the 28th of November, Luther formally appealed "*a Papa ad Concilium*."¹⁹⁶ He patterned his communication after the celebrated appeal of the Sorbonne.¹⁹⁷ The suppliant declares that he does not propose to say anything against the authority of the apostolic see or the power of "our most holy lord the pope, the well advised"¹⁹⁸—the last qualification pointing to the writer's determination to have the truth of Scripture as the supreme arbiter; for the pope is a man, like ourselves, compassed with infirmity, capable of erring, sinning, lying and becoming vain,¹⁹⁹ whom it is our duty to oppose to the face, if he enjoins or decrees anything contrary to the divine commandments.²⁰⁰ In a word, "*potestas Papae*" is "*non contra nec supra sed pro et infra scripturae et veritatis maiestatem*," and a "*sacrosanctum Concilium in spiritus sancto legitime congregatum, sanctam ecclesiam catholicam repraesentans*" is "*in causis fidem concernentibus supra Papam*."

In a letter to Wenzelaus Link (December 11, 1518) still another light is thrown upon Luther's conception of the curia at this time: he surmises that in it the true Antichrist is reigning.²⁰¹

¹⁹⁶ *Werke*, ii, pp. 34-40.

¹⁹⁷ The curialists were opposed to such appeals; e.g., Cajetan, *ibid.*, ii, p. 8, ll. 12 f. On the various views regarding the authority of the general council on the eve of the Reformation, see Kolde, as cited, pp. 1-8.

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, ii, p. 37, ll. 4 ff.

¹⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 37, ll. 9 ff., 18 ff.

²⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 39, ll. 31 f.

²⁰¹ deWette, as cited, i, p. 193. Undritz, as cited, p. 589, wrongly puts "the pope and the papacy" for "the Roman curia." It was in a letter to Spalatin, March 13, 1519 (deWette, i, p. 239) that he said, "I do not know, whether the pope is Antichrist or his apostle," and in another to the same friend, dated Feb. 24, 1520 (Enders, as cited, ii, p. 332, l. 37), that he said, "I do not doubt that the pope is truly that Antichrist whom the world by common opinion is looking for." For the then

By the close of the year 1518, then, we find that Luther has inwardly and outwardly broken with all the traditional authorities of the Church except those of a general council and the Scriptures. Aristotle and the Schoolmen have no normative value apart from their agreement with the Scriptures. The fathers, too, are not always trustworthy; even *their* highest service is that of promoting a right understanding of the sacred text. The decretals have lost their authority altogether; for popes can err and have repeatedly erred. The significance of the developments at Augsburg lies in the fact that the condemned heretic definitely abandons the curialistic in favor of the conciliar theory regarding the seat of the highest ecclesiastical authority.²⁰² And if he has admitted that councils as well as popes may err, he has not yet declared that any council ever has erred, and he still sincerely believes that the council for which he has asked will make no mistake in his case. In fact, then, if not as yet in theory, the Scripture is his only authority. It alone can decide questions of faith.

The next year, 1519, witnessed the rejection of the authority of the council, leaving only that of the Scriptures, alike in principle and in practice. To this final stage in the solution of his problem we now turn our attention.

The extreme conservatism of the Reformer is nowhere more clearly seen than in the slow and vacillating manner in which he accepted the consequence of some of his bolder declarations concerning the authority of the church council. In a letter of early January,²⁰³ after the interview with

current views of Antichrist, see Bauer, "Luther und der Papst" in *Schriften des Ver. f. Reformationsgeschichte*, xxvii Jahrg., pp. 251-253; also Hans Preuss, *Die Vorstellungen vom Antichrist in späteren Mittelalter, bei Luther und in der konfessionellen Polemik*, Leipzig, 1916, especially pp. 83-183.

²⁰² Undritz (as cited, p. 574, cf. p. 588) is not accurate in characterizing the results at Augsburg as an "innerer Bruch mit der Autorität von Papst, Konzil und Kirche." Cf. Scheel, *Luthers Stellung, etc.*, pp. 26 and 29.

²⁰³ *Briefe* (de Wette) i, pp. 207 f.

Miltitz at Altenburg, he promises the Elector Frederick that he will remain silent, if his opponents do; that he will "humbly submit" to the pope and confess to him that he has been "too fiery and sharp"; that he will publish a statement admonishing the people to obey the Roman Church and not to construe his writings as a disgrace but as an honor to this Church; and lastly that he will accept the verdict of a German bishop regarding the whole controversy.²⁰⁴ But he closes with the laconic sentence: "For nothing will come of the revocation." In the promised "humble" letter to the pope²⁰⁵ he certainly goes to the extreme of submissiveness, and in the *Unterricht auf etliche Artikel*—before February 24, 1519—he redeems his pledge that he would urge obedience to the Roman Church; but at the same time he insists that God's commandments should be honored, and that the question of the extent of the papal power²⁰⁶ is not essential to salvation but may be settled by the learned. Ere long, indeed, he felt dissatisfied with even these concessions.²⁰⁷

The issue concerning the supreme ecclesiastical authority became acute early in the year 1519, when Prof. Dürer, sheim of Leipzig, having learned that Luther in the privacy of his class room, was challenging the *ius divinum* of the papal supremacy, sought by means of several lengthy letters to elicit from the Reformer a statement of his arguments on this point.²⁰⁸ We need not dwell upon this correspondence. It is sufficient to say that Luther used the legislation of the Council of Nicæa (325 A.D.) as

²⁰⁴ We need not inquire as to how his willingness to submit to such a tribunal is to be harmonized with his appeal to a council. From the beginning he had no confidence in this compromise measure, and probably did not take it seriously; *ibid.*, pp. 211, 216 f.

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 233 ff. Concerning the error of the traditional date, March 3, which is much too late, see Enders, as cited, I, p. 444, n. 1, and Preuss, as cited, p. 58.

²⁰⁶ *Werke*, Weimar, ii, p. 72, ll. 35 ff.; p. 71, ll. 1 ff.; p. 73, ll. 6 ff.

²⁰⁷ Enders, ii, p. 2, ll. 45 ff.

²⁰⁸ Löscher, as cited, iii, p. 22.

proof for his contention that either the papacy is not of divine right or the Nicene fathers were heretics,²⁰⁹ and that his main authority was the Scripture, according to which "the apostles were all equal."²¹⁰ Dungersheim's second letter is a laborious attempt to defend the theory of the divine right of the papacy. In reply Luther magnifies the testimony of the Scriptures,²¹¹ saying that it is his custom, following the examples of Augustine and Bernhard, to trace the brooks back to their sources,²¹² and that he does not believe that he commits any sin when he dissents from the fathers in some obscure text.²¹³ Even Augustine is not a perfect interpreter of Scripture.²¹⁴

The truce to which Luther and Miltitz had agreed was broken in February, 1519, when the former, justly feeling himself attacked by the theses which the latter had published, nominally against Carlstadt, in August, 1518, composed twelve counter-theses answering those of the papal champion point for point. Both sides understood that the ques-

²⁰⁹ Enders, i, p. 367; deWette i, p. 206. Undritz, as cited, p. 593, owing to his acceptance of the incorrect date for the letter to Leo X (see note 205) wrongly dates this letter in April.

²¹⁰ *Ibid*: '*Ego autem nitor verbis Evangelii, quod omnes Apostoli fuerunt aequales, et illo Matthaei xviii, 'quodcunque solveritis, etc.'*' Undritz (pp. 594 f.), doubtless following Kolde (as cited, p. 41, n. 2), regards this as the first clear and distinct expression of the consciously recognized Scripture principle. Certainly the declaration is quite striking; and Undritz rightly emphasizes "the inner ripening" of the Reformer in this controversial period. But we cannot accept the fanciful distinction that Undritz makes between this sentence as a mere stating of the Scripture principle and later utterances as postulations of the principle. On the other hand, Scheel, *Luthers Stellung, etc.*, p. 30, seems to go too far in the other direction in saying: "Von einem Schriftprinzip darf man hier überhaupt nicht sprechen, nicht einmal von einem humanistischen (Preuss [*op. cit.*], p. 60)." Scheel's statement, "Die Schrift ist also nur ein historisches Beweissmittel neben anderen, in diesem Fall gleichwertigen," is true, but the implication seems to be that it is only in religious or moral considerations that we need regard the Scripture as a normative authority.

²¹¹ Enders, i, pp. 438 ff.

²¹² *Ibid.*, p. 439 ll. 60 ff.

²¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 440, ll. 94 f.

²¹⁴ *Ibid.*, ll. 80 ff.

tions would be discussed at Leipzig in the near future. Later they each inserted an additional thesis on the freedom of the will. The most important proposition was the thirteenth, on the primacy of the pope. Luther's contention was the following: "*Romanam Ecclesiam esse omnibus aliis superiorem, probatur ex frigidissimis Romanorum Pontificum decretis intra cccc annos natis, contra quae sunt historiae approbatae MC annorum, textus scripturae divinae et decretum Niceni Concilii omnium Sacratissimi.*"²¹⁵

He did not question the primacy of honor given to the pope through many centuries, but he complained of the papal perversion of the Scriptures and denied that Christ was not head of the Oriental Church.²¹⁶ In his *Operationes* on the Psalter and in his Commentary on Galatians (March and April, 1519) he criticised the unspiritual conception of the Church which the papal party defended, and again attacked the divine right of the papal supremacy.²¹⁷

In May or June, shortly before the Debate at Leipzig, Luther published some of the results of his painstaking studies in the early history of the Church, in his *Resolutio . . . super propositione xiii de potestate papae*. In this lengthy dissertation he sets forth his new views of the Church as a spiritual organization, and, while admitting the primacy of the pope on grounds of human right and custom, denies that either Scripture or the Nicene Council supports the theory of the divine right of the papacy.²¹⁸ Many decretals are not genuine;²¹⁹ they are not only "*frigidissima*" but also "*impiissima*,"²²⁰ and one of them is blasphemous.

²¹⁵ *Werke*, Weimar, ii, p. 161, ll. 35 ff., in the *Disputatio et Excusatio F. Martini Luther adversus criminationes D. Iohannis Eccii*. Cf. the slightly different form of the thesis in the *Resolutio Lutheriana super propositione sua . . . de potestate papae*, *ibid.*, p. 185, ll. 8 ff.

²¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 159, ll. 12 ff.

²¹⁷ *Ibid.*, v, p. 61, ll. 1 ff., p. 131, ll. 27 ff.; ii, p. 447, ll. 28 ff., *et passim*.

²¹⁸ *Ibid.*, ii, p. 227, ll. 28 ff.; p. 189, ll. 27 ff.; p. 194, ll. 24 ff. (on John xxi. 18); p. 201, ll. 36 ff.

²¹⁹ *Ibid.*, ii, p. 202, ll. 12 ff.; p. 203, ll. 10 ff.; p. 209, ll. 15 f.

²²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 204, ll. 31 f.

mous.²²¹ The real *ius divinum* is the Scripture itself.²²² No wonder that the Hussites began to look upon Luther as one of their own number.²²³

The Leipzig Disputation brought the issue to a head.²²⁴ In his initial protestation, Luther, following Carlstadt, accepted the "Catholic" (not the "Roman") Church and the Scriptures as his judge.²²⁵ Eck began the discussion, on the morning of July 4th, with a virtual begging of the question: "The monarchy and single headship in the Church of God is of divine right and was instituted by Christ; therefore, the texts of sacred Scripture or established history do not oppose it."²²⁶ Luther argued that Christ is the head of the Church, and then by means of Scripture and historical considerations showed—as before in the *Resolutio*—that the pope has no divine right to ecclesiastical supremacy.²²⁷

On the morning of the 5th, Eck cleverly prepares the way for an identification of Luther's view with those of Wyclif and Huss, which had been condemned at the famous council of Constance, among them being the following: "It is not necessary to salvation to believe that the Roman Church is supreme among the rest", and "Peter is not and was not the head of the holy Roman Catholic Church."²²⁸ The uncertainty still prevailing in Luther's position is revealed,

²²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 218, ll. 29 f.

²²² *Ibid.*, p. 279, l. 24 (in the Leipzig Debate; but the idea underlies the argument in the *Resolutio* itself). Cf. p. 184, ll. 2 f., and ll. 19 ff.; and Köstlin, *Luthers Theologie*,² i, p. 233.

²²³ Cf. Kolde, as cited, pp. 46 f.

²²⁴ We assume that the general course of the debate is sufficiently familiar. The details may be read in Löscher, *op. cit.*, iii, pp. 214 ff.; the Weimar edition, ii, pp. 251 ff.; Köstlin, *M. Luther*, pp. 258 ff.; and Preuss, as cited, pp. 76 ff.

²²⁵ *Werke*, Weimar, ii, p. 254, note 1. Cf. p. 264, ll. 3 ff.: "*sed in contentione accipiendus est sensus genuinus et proprius scripture, qui stare in acie possit, a quo sancti patres nonnunquam locupletande orationis gratia digrediuntur et sine culpa*" (as against even Bernard).

²²⁶ *Ibid.*, ii, p. 255, ll. 25.

²²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 257 f.

²²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 275, ll. 8 ff.

on the one hand, by his indignant rejection of the charge that he is a member of "the Bohemian faction," and by his assurance that he was always opposed to this schism; and, on the other, by his expression of wonder that among so many foes of the Bohemians no one has ever worthily refuted their error to the glory of the Roman Church.²²⁹ Then in the afternoon of that day, reverting to the same point, but still explicitly refusing to defend the defection of the Bohemians, he affirms that "it is certain, that among the articles of John Huss or the Bohemians many are plainly most Christian and evangelical, which the universal Church cannot condemn, as for example this one: 'there is only one universal church.'"²³⁰ Eck triumphantly accuses him of being inoculated with "the Bohemian virus" of pretending to "know the Scriptures better than do the pontiffs, councils, doctors and universities,"²³¹ and charges him with impugning the authority of "the holy and praiseworthy council of Constance."²³² Thrice in the course of the afternoon Luther interrupts Eck with sharp denials and charges of falsehood. Obviously, the Reformer does not grasp the significance of his own statements. Almost a year ago—at Augsburg—he had said that a council can err; but never yet had he said that a council has erred. And he is even now shocked by the logic of his declaration concerning the condemned articles of Huss and the Bohemians, and in his confusion he can only discount his own words. The next day, with growing boldness, but still with a measure of inconsistency amounting to sophistry, he declares that four sentences of Huss are scriptural and evangelical, but at once seeks to save the authority of the council of Constance, by saying that among the sentences of Huss condemned by this tribunal not all were heretical, but some were "erroneous, some blasphemous, some foolhardy, some seditious, some

²²⁹ *Ibid.*, ll. 35 ff., and p. 278, ll. 29 ff.

²³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 279, ll. 10 ff.

²³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 282, ll. 12 ff.

²³² *Ibid.*, p. 283, ll. 27 ff.

offensive to pious ears," or else the condemnations were interpolated in the record.²³³ Doubtless, he feels the weakness of such a defence, and presently, relying upon Augustine and Tudesco, he boldly declares that the word of God is infallible and that the council is its creature.²³⁴ He repeats the familiar biblical and historical arguments against the divine right of the papacy, and finds fault with Eck for using no Scripture except Matt. xvi. 18f., and even that in a way contrary to the interpretation of the majority of the ancient fathers.²³⁵

On the morning of July 7th, Luther seems to retreat from his advanced position of two days before, and to involve himself more deeply in inconsistencies.²³⁶ On the one hand, he agrees with Eck, that "the dicisions of councils in matters of faith are by all means to be accepted"; but on the other hand, he at once adds: "this only do I reserve for myself . . . that a council has at times erred, and can at times err, especially in those things which do not pertain to faith; neither has a council the authority to set up new articles of faith."²³⁷ The inference is unavoidable, that even in matters of faith a council has at times erred. Far-reaching as the statement is, it is for the present a mere deduction from a single word, the adverb "especially." And whereas about a year ago—in the Resolutions on indulgence—²³⁸ he asserted that a council alone could make new articles of faith, he now denies it this right. It is no final authority. Under the circumstances it is rather strange that Eck did not more thoroughly exploit this alleged agreement with himself, particularly in view of Luther's demand that Eck show "that a council cannot err, has not erred or does not err, since a council cannot make a divine right out of that which by its nature is not divine right," and only that

²³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 285 f., p. 288, ll. 14 ff.

²³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 288, ll. 32 ff., p. 289, ll. 1 ff.

²³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 297, ll. 12 ff.

²³⁶ Cf. Köstlin, *M. Luther*,⁴ pp. 266.

²³⁷ *Werke*, as cited, ii, p. 303, ll. 16 ff.

²³⁸ *Ibid.*, i, p. 568, ll. 19 ff., p. 579, ll. 33 ff.

is heretical "which is contrary to divine right."²³⁹ On July 11th, in connection with the discussion of indulgences, he again reveals how hard it is for him to break with this last species of ecclesiastical authority, that of the council. For he concedes: "I believe that the council and the Church never err in matters of faith; in other things it is not necessary not to err."²⁴⁰ To be sure, he here explicitly differs from Eck as to the extent of this category of "matters of faith." Indulgences, according to Luther, are not to be included in the list. Errors of practice in this realm are not to be regarded as deviations from the truth. But in itself this statement as to the reliability of the council in matters of faith conflicts with his testimony on July 5th, when he virtually charged the council of Constance with error in the case of a "*nobilissimum articulum fidei*."²⁴¹ But in his vacillation on this point he again makes the Scripture his supreme authority, saying, among other things, that the church cannot give a book—he is thinking of II Maccabees—more authority or strength than it has in itself,²⁴² and that "a council cannot make Scripture"—he has the theory of indulgences in mind—"out of that which by its nature is not Scripture, just as the Church was not able to make the Gospels, even though it approved the Gospels."²⁴³

The significance of the Leipzig Disputation, then, is to be found in the conclusion, qualified, yet decisive, which Luther was forced by his opponent to accept in regard to the general council. That authority is only of a secondary, because derived, character. True, neither in the debate itself nor in his letters of the next few weeks,²⁴⁴ does he

²³⁹ *Ibid.*, ii, p. 308, ll. 30 ff., p. 313, ll. 3 ff.

²⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, ii, p. 339, ll. 25 ff., p. 347, ll. 3 ff.

²⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 279, l. 16.

²⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 325, ll. 17 ff.

²⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 329, ll. 32 ff.

²⁴⁴ Cf. the letter to Spalatin, July 20, 1519, and that to the Elector Frederick, August 18, 1519, in deWette, as cited, i, especially pages 286 and 314.

consistently and definitively settle the question as to whether the council of Constance erred in a matter of faith. But in the course of the summer, alike in his *Resolutiones Lutherianae super propositionibus suis Lipsiae disputatis* (end of August) and in his *Contra malignum Iohannis Eccii iudicium* (September) he repeatedly declares that the council did err.²⁴⁵

And from this time on he more and more emphasizes the supreme and exclusive authority of the Scriptures. The following deliverance is typical: "*Et ut plane et libere dicam, quod sentio, credo me theologum esse Christianum et in regno veritatis vivere, ideo me debitorem esse non modo affirmandae veritatis, set etiam asserendae et defendae seu per sanguinem seu per mortem. Proinde volo liber esse et nullius seu Concilii seu potestatis seu universitatum seu pontificis autoritate captivus fieri.*"²⁴⁶ The ground for this conviction lies in the fact that "the holy Scripture is the Word of God."²⁴⁷ and that the divine Spirit is himself the teacher of the true sense of the revelation.²⁴⁸ The pope is Antichrist for this reason chiefly, that, unlike Lucifer, who wished only to be on an equality with God, he arrogates

²⁴⁵ *Werke*, Weimar, ii, p. 405, ll. 20 ff.; p. 406, ll. 5 ff., 12 ff., 26 ff.; p. 410, ll. 10 ff.; p. 651, ll. 27 ff.

²⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 404, ll. 10 ff.

²⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 649, l. 15. The rest of the sentence is as follows: "*quod si asina diceret, audiendum est etiam prae omnibus angelis, si verbum dei non haberent, nedum prae papa et concilio sine verbo dei agentibus.*" In view of this and many similar passages that might be quoted, especially from the later works of Luther, it is evident that Harnack is beside the mark with this statement (*Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*,⁴ iii, p. 858): "Luther opponirte aber in derselben Zeit, in der er den Kampf gegen die Autorität der Concilien so tapfer führte, auch gegen die Unfehlbarkeit der Schrift." The free critical attitude of Luther toward the Scriptures is not to be interpreted as if, in his judgment, they were fallible like the deliverances of a council.

²⁴⁸ Cf. the letter to Spalatin, Feb. 12, 1519; "*Vides quam Evangelii verba se ipsa exponunt, suasque glossas secum habent ut nihil necesse sit aliena et humana misceri*" (deWette, i, p. 226), also *Werke*, Weimar, ii, p. 429, ll. 25 ff.; p. 431, ll. 24 ff., 35 f.; and Thimme, as cited, pp. 650 ff., *et passim*.

to himself the exclusive right to interpret the Scriptures and therefore places himself above God.²⁴⁹

There is no need of pursuing the investigation into Luther's later works. The year 1519 marks the close of his development of the principle that the Scripture is not only the chief but the only norm for Christian faith and conduct. True, the mere assertion of the principle did not necessarily secure its practical application against the other authorities with which it came into more or less bitter conflict.²⁵⁰ But henceforth there were no vacillations or retrogressions as to the validity of what is now recognized as the formal principle of Protestantism.²⁵¹

Upon the basis of his deep experience of the grace of God revealed in the Gospel, Luther was led step by step, by the inner necessities of his faith and especially by the opposition of his foes, to estimate for himself the whole series of authorities which as a dutiful son of the Roman Catholic Church he had revered from his earliest years and which he continued to recognize, though with varying degrees of satisfaction and assurance, for a considerable time after he had raised what he regarded as a merely academic question, that concerning the nature of indulgences. First of all, the Scholastics, with their patron in philosophy, Aristotle, were discredited: their views no longer accorded

²⁴⁹ *Werke*, Weimar, ii, p. 430, ll. 1 ff. (with reference to II Thess. ii. 4). The context deals with Luther's attempt to harmonize Augustine's famous dictum, "Evangelio non crederem, nisi Ecclesiae crederem," with his own changed conception as to the right relation between the authority of the Scriptures and that of the Church, including the fathers, the pope, and the council.

²⁵⁰ Undritz, as cited, pp. 602 ff., traces the use made of the Scripture principle by Luther up to the Diet of Worms (1521). But he admits that "the real development" of the principle is finished by September, 1519 (*Contra malignum I. Eccii . . . Defensio*). His contention that before 1519 the principle was only asserted but thereafter was made a postulate as against the adversary, is not borne out by the facts. There is only a greater clearness in apprehending, and a firmer determination in applying the principle, alike for offensive and defensive purposes.

²⁵¹ Cf. his later statements in the *Tischreden*, Erlangen ed., pp. 34, 92.

with his reflections upon his own evangelical experience and upon the teachings of that Apostle whose words on justifying faith had proved his chief comfort in the great crisis of his life. The controversy concerning indulgences then led to the repudiation of the authority of the pope as a fallible human being, whose official utterances often perverted the Scriptures as much as their evil lives dishonored its precepts. After the interview with Cajetan at Augsburg, Luther lost his earlier confidence in the fathers as trustworthy guides in the interpretation of the Bible: they frequently contradicted one another, and their teachings, especially on the subject of the primacy of the pontiff, were erroneous. The appeal from the pope to the council introduced a period of uncertainties, but at the Leipzig Disputation he spoke the fateful word that sooner or later had to lead to a repudiation of the last of these medieval authorities: the council of Constance, in one of the "noblest articles of faith," condemned sentences that are "most Christian and evangelical." Only the Scriptures were left him, and to his believing soul they authenticated themselves more and more as the word of God—the "*verbum Dei*" which is "*veritas*"²⁴² and which for that reason constitutes for every member of the true or universal Church the real "*ius divinum*."²⁵³

In a future issue of this REVIEW we shall endeavor to present, in a systematic form, Luther's varied views concerning the nature of the Scriptures as the supreme authority for Christian faith and life.

Princeton.

FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER.

²⁵² Cf. *Werke*, Weimar, iii, p. 397, ll. 12 f., p. 454, l. 25.

²⁵³ *Ibid.*, ii, p. 279, l. 24.

GALATIANS THE EPISTLE OF PROTESTANTISM

On October 31, 1517, Martin Luther, at the age of thirty-four, published his ninety-five theses on the door of the Castle church of Wittenberg, protesting against Tetzel's colossal scandal of hawking Papal indulgences, or, as Erasmus calls it, "the crime of false pardons". That day signalized, as Guizot observes, "a great insurrection of human intelligence"; and, in the estimation of James Anthony Froude, was "the most memorable day in modern European history". Two years later (1519), at Leipzig, Luther met Eck, the Pope's legate, in an "intellectual tournament", in which he unflinchingly maintained his attitude of protestation. Again in 1521, before the Diet of Worms, Luther, alone, still more courageously and boldly defended himself against not only the church but also the State. Froude calls his appearance before the Diet "the most notable spectacle witnessed on the planet since Christ stood before Pilate". To be sure Luther was condemned by the Diet, but in reality it was not Luther but the Word of God which was condemned. For his sole weapon throughout the whole controversy was the Bible; and never for one moment did he forget that the weapons of Christian force are spiritual.

During these years he published his very original and now celebrated commentary on Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, which appeared first in Latin in 1519, then in German in 1525, and again in Latin, revised and augmented, in 1532. In 1575 it was translated into English. It fills five hundred and seventy-five closely printed octavo pages, with approximately five hundred words on a page.¹ As an exposition of the Epistle, it occupies a place by itself. From beginning to end it is one great polemic. Though copious and somewhat prosy, no commentator ever got

¹ On the first chapter of the Epistle alone, Luther wrote 62 pages of comment; 95 on chapter 2; 164 on chapter 3; 100 on chapter 4; 91 on chapter 5; and 22 on chapter 6.

closer to the heart of the great Apostle. The English translator in his Preface unhesitatingly claims that "no greater comfort to the soul of man can be found in any book next to the Holy Scripture than in this Commentary of Martin Luther". As the then Bishop of London in his Foreword to the Reader observes, "the author felt what he spoke and had experience of what he wrote". Luther himself informs us that the commentary was written to satisfy his conscience, and only after he had "preached Christ and fought against the devil in his false teachers a great while". Luther loved the Epistle to the Galatians as his Katharine von Bora; he used to say in his lectures upon it, "This is my epistle, I am wedded to it." Through it he rediscovered the gospel and gave it back to Christianity. Religion confessedly was almost dead when Luther came.

THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE GALATIANS

The Pauline authorship of the Epistle has never been seriously questioned. As to its origin, it grew out of a controversy between Paul and the Judaizers, and is stamped throughout with the characteristic features of the Pauline mind and spirit. As a picture of the great apostle and a monument of his missionary encounters, it is an invaluable trophy. Certain Pharisaic Judaizers were attempting, by all the crafty means they could devise, to undermine the authority of Paul, and were strenuously contending that a Gentile in order to become a Christian must first become a Jew and be circumcised. Thus they twisted and perverted the gospel, and as "seducers" of the Galatians they made of Christ, as Luther expresses it, "a destroyer and a murderer; and of Moses a Saviour". In this retrograde movement of the Galatian churches, Paul saw a renunciation of grace which amounted to a virtual renunciation of Christ (Gal. v. 9). It really seemed as if Christianity might be strangled in its cradle by the iron hand of the law. The battle was one between legalism and liberty. The Galatians were "falling from grace" (Gal. v. 4). Accordingly Paul burn-

ing with indignation, rebukes the Galatians for yielding to their false teachers, and with zealous vehemence most conclusively proves to them that the Law can add nothing to the glory of the Gospel. The battle raged in particular around the rite of circumcision, but the matter was really a question of Judaic ritual versus Christian liberty. Paul wrote vigorously because he felt keenly; and, in spite of the torrential sweep of his feelings, he pursued so logical a course and thought so deeply that, under God, he has made a most important contribution to the literature of religion. The Epistle is formally addressed "unto the churches of Galatia" (Gal. i. 2). The name "Galatia" in Paul's day, stood for not only a particular district but also an entire Roman province. By the Romans it was called originally Gallograecia. This was the great central province of Asia Minor, which was some 200 miles long by 100 miles broad and from 2000 to 3000 feet in altitude above the level of the sea. Within this province there were large and flourishing cities which ethnically, were "cities of Lycaonia and Pisidia". The population of the districts was mixed, being composed of Jews and Celts. The Celts had migrated, 20,000 strong, into Asia Minor in 278 B. C. They were by nature warm-hearted, generous and affectionate, but also impulsive and excitable, fickle and vain, and easily swept to and fro by capricious currents of religious emotion. They were also extremely arrogant, and addicted to vices such as the lust of the flesh. Consequently they possessed, as one might say, a predisposition to work out their own salvation. Whether the churches which Paul addresses were those of Ancyra, Pessinus, Gordium and Tavium in North Galatia, as the older authorities (Weiss, Lipsius, Sieffert, Lightfoot, Davidson and Godet) assumed; or, the churches of Antioch, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe in Phrygia. Pisidia and Lycaonia, the foundations of which Paul with Barnabas had laid on his first missionary journey (Acts xiii-xiv), it is difficult to decide. But modern authorities (Perrot, Weizsäcker, Hausrath, Zahn, Pfeiderer, Ramsay,

Bacon and others) point with ever increasing confidence to the latter. So far as we know from the book of The Acts these southern cities were the only parts of the Galatian Province Paul ever visited. These he also visited on his second missionary journey, with Silas, and again on his third, when he is said to have passed through "the region of Galatia and Phrygia, in order, establishing all the disciples" (xviii. 23; cf. Acts xvi. 6). And we know from the Epistle itself that he had already visited these churches twice (Gal. iv. 13).

It has usually been supposed that the Epistles to the Thessalonians are the oldest of Paul's letters. But the opinion seems to be gaining ground that the Epistles to the Galatians is the earliest of all Paul's extant writings, and accordingly the oldest of all the writings in the New Testament. Rendall in the *Expositor's Greek Testament*, 1903, (p. 147) concludes, "that the Epistle was written from Corinth before the arrival of Silas and Timothy, in which case it is the earliest Epistle of Paul now extant, being written before the Epistles to the Thessalonians". Theodor Zahn in his *Introduction to the New Testament*, 1909, (pp. 198-9), speaks of it as "the earliest of Paul's letters that have come down to us", and dates it "after March in the year 53 A. D., not very long before the arrival of Silas and Timothy in Corinth and the writing of I Thessalonians". B. W. Bacon in his *Commentary on Galatians*, 1909, (pp. 32, 39, 41) assigns it to essentially the same place in the chronological sequence of the Apostle's career (50 A. D.), and speaks of it as "the first great contemporary document of the Church." McGiffert in his *Apostolic Age*, 1897, (pp 226-7), concludes that it was written "while Paul was still in Antioch and before he had started on his second missionary journey"; and hence is "the earliest of Paul's epistles known to us". Michaelis and Koppe also make it the earliest of all Paul's epistles; Calvin assigned it a date before the Council at Jerusalem; and it should not be forgotten that Galatians stands first in the Canon of Marcion, though probably

Marcion did not intend to arrange the books of the New Testament in his list chronologically. With this view of its early origin, the writer is more and more inclined to agree.

The contents of the Epistle fall naturally into three divisions: Chapters i-iii, personal, a defence of Paul's apostleship; Chapters iii-iv, doctrinal, a defence of Paul's gospel; Chapters v-vi, practical, an exhortation to the Galatians to use wisely the liberty of the gospel, and to labor together in Christian sympathy and love. More minutely, the order of the Apostle's thought is as follows: At the outset he expresses deep astonishment at the willingness of the Galatians to yield to the Judaizers; and he frankly pronounces an emphatic anathema upon those who would teach any other gospel than that which he had himself already preached to them (i. 6-10). He then proceeds to vindicate his apostolic authority; alleging that his conversion from Judaism to Christianity was nothing less than a miracle, that his commission as an apostle was nothing less than supernatural, being in no way received from man, even from the so-called "pillars" of the church, but from God, direct, through revelation (i. 11-ii. 21). He next undertakes to defend the main thesis of his epistle, namely, Justification by Faith, demonstrating its validity from both experience and history: thus by appealing to their own experience (iii. 1-5); recalling the covenant of God with Abraham (6-14); showing the priority of the Abrahamic promise to the Mosaic Law (15-29); drawing an analogy between spiritual and domestic sonship (iv. 1-11); reminding them of their former warm, personal affection for him (12-20); and, pointing to the sons of Hagar and Sarah as allegorically representative, respectively, of descent through "the flesh" and through "the promise" (21-31). Finally, he concludes with an ethical application of the whole argument; showing how Christians, therefore, are logically free from the law (v. 1-12); how love guards Christian liberty from becoming mere license (13-15); how the Spirit guides the

free man's walk (16-25); how strong men, spiritually, ought to help restore those who stumble (vi. 1-5); and, how teachers have a peculiar claim upon their pupils (6-10); closing, with a brief summary of the teaching of the entire letter, and affixing his personal autograph, and a final benediction (11-18). The Epistle to the Romans is but an expanded edition of the Epistle to the Galatians.

To all evangelical Protestants the Epistle to the Galatians is peculiarly precious because it sets forth the distinctive, differentiating tenet of Protestant faith, namely, the fundamental doctrine of man's ruin through sin and of salvation through grace; or, as it is commonly called, the doctrine of Justification by Faith. Paul himself regarded this doctrine as the indefeasible magna charta of religious democracy; while Luther, by rediscovering and expounding it, gave back to the Church its lost palladium of spiritual freedom and independence. This letter, accordingly, has very appropriately been called "The Epistle of Protestantism". It banishes utterly legalism and ceremonialism from the Christian religion; it shows the futility of trying to win salvation by human effort; and it breaks down once and forever the partition wall between individuals and nations. Had the Epistle to the Galatians been duly appreciated by the Church; had it really become a vital principle in the life of Protestants, this world-war, in my judgment, would never have taken place, or, at least, it would have been restricted to those bearing some other name than Protestant. But alas! with shame we must allow that Protestantism is undergoing an awful eclipse. As Professor Stalker says, "The situation reminds us painfully of the failure of Protestantism to be a uniting bond strong enough to curb the passions provoking war" (*Quarterly Register*, May, 1917, p. 142).

LUTHER'S EXPOSITION OF THE EPISTLE

Certain great outstanding theological concepts seized hold of Luther's mind as he studied this Epistle; the first of which was Justification, or righteousness, *δικαιοσύνη*. The

verbal root of this word means "to pronounce righteous", and corresponds to the Hebrew verb הִצַּדִּיק, to "declare righteous". The two are closely synonymous. The term affirms that, in spite of past sin, an accused person may stand in right relations to God,—through the sacrifice of Christ. It does not mean that he has not sinned in the past, nor that he has become a righteous character, but that now God, his holy judge, treats him as righteous. The New Testament word has a double aspect; a forensic or judicial, by which the sinner is acquitted and pronounced guiltless; and a paternal, by which the Father forgives the sinner and treats him as just. Luther does not pause to dilate upon this double aspect of the term, but he does emphasize with superlative force that justification with God is wholly an act of grace, that by it the sinner is delivered from the power of sin, that salvation is due entirely to Christ's death upon the cross, that it costs the sinner nothing, that Christ, in the act of his humiliation, emptied himself, giving all that he had, that his death was a complete undoing of all the mischief wrought by Satan, and that by means of it the sinner is set free from all bondage and peril, is clothed with a righteousness not his own, and through faith in Christ's vicarious atonement obtains eternal life. Indeed, the great Protestant reformer, on nearly every page of his voluminous commentary, iterates and reiterates with tremendous and almost crescendo emphasis, that we are saved alone by the operation of God, not by the coöperation of man; by God's monergism, not by man's synergism (as Erasmus and Melanchthon advocated); and that the doctrine of Justification is the key of the Christian faith; indeed, that it is more than a mere doctrine of Christianity, that it is nothing less than Christianity itself; and he further claims that it presupposes not only the whole work of Christ for our salvation, but also of the Holy Trinity; expiation being made to the Father, by the Son, and applied to us by the Holy Spirit.

Faith, πίστις, is another great concept of the Epistle.

Luther emphasizes different phases of it. (1) Life in Christ by faith. The passage of supreme interest to him was Gal. ii. 20, which reads, "I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me: and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself up for me." Luther comments on this passage at great length. He says: "Here the apostle plainly sheweth by what means he liveth; and he teacheth what true Christian righteousness is. Christ and I must be entirely conjoined and united together, so that he may live in me and I in him. This seemeth a very strange and monstrous manner of speaking, thus to say: I live, I live not; I am dead, I am not dead; I am a sinner, I am not a sinner. Yet by faith thou art so entirely and nearly joined unto Christ that he and thou art made, as it were, one person; so that thou mayst boldly say, I am now one with Christ, that is to say, Christ's righteousness, victory and life are mine. And again, Christ may say, I am that sinner, that is, his sins and his death are mine, because he is united and joined unto me, and I unto him. For by faith we are so joined together that we are become one flesh and one bone, members of the body of Christ."

(2) To Luther, faith meant assurance as well as belief and trust. When he says, "*fides sola justificat*", he really means, "*fiducia sola justificat*". Listen to his comments on Gal. iv. 6: "We ought, therefore, to be surely persuaded that not only our office, but our person pleaseth God. For so long as Jesus Christ, that most mighty giant, is at the right hand of God, making intercession for us, we cannot doubt of the grace and favor of God towards us. Moreover God hath also sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, as Paul here saith. But Christ is most certain in his spirit that he pleaseth God; therefore we also, having the same Spirit of Christ, must be assured that we are under grace for his sake, which is most assured."

(3) Some of the outward signs of faith warranting as-

surance, as Luther gives them, are, "gladly to hear of Christ, to preach and teach Christ, to render thanks unto him, to praise him, to confess him, yea, with the loss of goods and life; moreover, to do our duty, according to our vocation as we are able; to help our needy brother, and to comfort the heavy-hearted, etc. By these signs as by certain effects and consequents, we are fully assured and confirmed that we are in God's favor; so that we may have the Holy Ghost. He that doubteth of God's favor towards him must needs doubt also of the promises of God, and so consequently of the will of God and of the benefits of Christ. But there can be no greater blasphemy against God than to deny his promises. The whole Scripture teacheth us, especially and above all things, that we should not doubt. Let us, therefore, give thanks unto God that we can assure ourselves that the Holy Ghost bringeth forth in our hearts such unspeakable groanings as Abba, Father, which are our guns and artillery in time of temptation, surpassing the eloquence of even a Demosthenes or a Ciceró."

(4) Luther, also, ventured to distinguish between faith and hope. He does so in connection with Gal. v. 5, which reads, "For we through the Spirit by faith wait for the hope of righteousness." He concedes that they cannot really be separated, and that they are as closely related to each other as the two cherubim over the mercy-seat; nevertheless, he claims there is a difference between them in their offices, working, and ends; thus, Faith resteth in the understanding, hope in the will; Faith teaches, prescribes and directs, hope exhorts to courage and boldness; Faith hath for her object truth, hope, the goodness of God; Faith is the beginning of life before tribulation, hope cometh after; Faith is a judge contending against errors and heresies, hope is the general in the field fighting against tribulation and desperation. Faith and hope, he says, resemble prudence and fortitude, which, too, cannot easily be severed. Fortitude is a constancy of mind which is not easily discouraged in adversity, prudence is her guide;

otherwise fortitude is but temerity and rashness. Fortitude would be useless and vain without prudence. So faith without hope is nothing, and hope without faith is presumption. "Hope is nothing else but a spiritual fortitude; and faith is nothing else but a spiritual prudence."

Law, *νόμος* is a third great word in Luther's exposition of this Epistle. It occurs in Galatians some thirty times: and usually in the sense of ritual law, though not always; rather, the apostle thinks of the whole law as one, as the law of God; his chief point being that statutory obedience is not the way of salvation. Luther repeatedly insists that Paul is speaking of the whole law, judicial, ceremonial and moral; that the ceremonial law was as well the law of God as the moral, and that circumcision, the institution of the priesthood, and the service and ceremonies of the temple were as well commanded of God as the Ten Commandments (Gal. ii. 16, 21); that, since Christ came, even the Ten Commandments, without faith in Christ, kill and bring death, even as do the ceremonial commandments; and that no law can be allowed to reign in the conscience, except the law of the Spirit and life, not because the law is evil but because it is not able to justify. "The law is holy, and the commandment holy, and righteous, and good" (Rom. vii. 12).

Nevertheless, the law is the minister of sin. For the more we go about to accomplish it, the more we transgress it. It says, "Thou never didst accomplish all that is commanded in the law; but accursed is he that hath not done all things contained therein." The book of The Acts most explicitly teaches that the Holy Ghost is not given by the Law, but by the hearing of the Gospel. "Now," argues Luther, "if the law had been able to justify and the righteousness of the law had been necessary to salvation, then doubtless the Holy Ghost had not been given to the Gentiles who kept not the law. But the Holy Ghost was given to them without the law, therefore, the law does not justify, but faith only in Christ which the Gospel setteth forth."

For this reason God gave "the promise" first, that it should not be said that righteousness was given through the law. For if God had wished that we be justified by the law, then he would have given the law four hundred and thirty years before the promise, or together with it.

But it may be asked, if the law does not justify why then was it given? "Wherefore then serveth the law?" (Gal. iii. 19). Why do we work all day when one hour will do? Luther answers, "Though it does not justify yet it is not unprofitable. It accuseth, terrifieth, and condemneth and is therefore good, if a man do rightly use it, that is, if he use the law as law. Let us not confound and confuse things. Let a man do a man's work, not a woman's; and so let not the law usurp the office of grace."

The law was added because of transgressions (Gal. iii. 19); the civil law, to restrain sin and bridle the wicked; the moral, to reveal unto man his impiety misery, blindness, ignorance, and hatred; that we may have an entrance into grace. "When the law so oppresseth thee that all things seem to be utterly desperate and thereby driveth thee to Christ for help and succor, then is the law in its true use, and through the Gospel it helpeth to justify. And this is the best and most perfect use of the law." But the law was added, not for ever, only for a time—till the time of grace, i.e., until Christ came. When he came, he "blotted out the bond written in ordinances that was against us, and nailed it to the cross" (Col. ii. 14).

The law is a schoolmaster (Gal. iii. 24), a tutor, to bring us unto Christ, not unto another lawgiver. Christ did not abolish the old law in order to give a new. When faith is revealed, the law and schoolmaster tormenteth us no more. Then we live no more under tyranny, but in joy and safety under Christ, who now so sweetly reigneth in us by his Spirit."

The Law is also a prison, to restrain us from doing evil. "Who ever loved him who kept him in prison? By the law we are restrained not of a free will, or for righteous-

ness' sake, but because the prison restraineth him that he cannot do it." Such restrained ones are only outwardly good; they are "shut up" (Gal. iii. 23, 24), and obey only on account of fear of punishment. "Such righteousness is no good," says Luther, "it is the righteousness of works. We still love sin and hate righteousness, and we detest God's law. The thief does not love his prison, neither does he hate his theft."

The Law, in fact, says Luther, is in conflict with Christ. "The law is a plain denial of Christ. Christ is king of grace and not of the law. The Old Testament regarded as a code is not Christian, is indeed anti-Christian, as every religion based on statutes, and therefore legal in spirit, must be; but as a revelation it has the promise of Christianity in it and bears witness to the gospel." In principle there are really two religions in the Bible: law and faith, works and grace, wages and promise. And the two are mutually exclusive. "Accordingly," says Luther, "I have nothing to do with the Law, because I have another law which striketh this law dumb, the law of liberty in Christ; for by Christ I am utterly freed from the law. Therefore the law, which is and remaineth a law to the wicked, is to me liberty, and bindeth that law which would condemn me." And he concludes, "Wherefore all laws are utterly abolished in the heart and conscience of a Christian; notwithstanding they remain, still, in the flesh. Banish, therefore, this stuttering, stammering Moses far from thee with his law, for it is impossible that Christ and the law should dwell together in the heart."

Works, *ἔργα* is another characteristic word of this Epistle and of Luther's vocabulary. By the reformer works are regarded not as the grounds of justification, as Pagans might claim justification on the same basis; Judas Iscariot did the self-same works that the other disciples did. Nor are they regarded as the ornament of faith. The Papists say that a good work before grace is able to obtain grace of congruence (*meritum de congruo*) because it is meet

that God should reward such a work; that works of charity are the ornament or perfection of faith; that good works can be heaped up as treasures of merit, sufficient for me to obtain eternal life for myself, and also to give or sell to others; that when a man doeth any good work God accepteth it, and for that work poureth into him charity infused, i.e., a quality remaining in the heart and called formal righteousness adorning the soul. But Luther, on the contrary, teaches that good works are the fruits of faith.

Works are the sequence of faith. He grants repeatedly that we must teach also the doctrine of good works and charity; but it must be done in time and place, that is to say, when it toucheth not the article of justification. In other words, good works must be done, and the law must be observed, not, however, as the grounds of justification, but as its sequence. He says: "Now after a man is once justified and possesseth Christ by faith, and knoweth that He (Christ) is his righteousness and life, doubtless he will not be idle; but as a good tree he will bring forth good fruits. For the believing man hath the Holy Ghost; and where the Holy Ghost dwelleth, he will not suffer a man to be idle, but stirreth him up to all exercises of piety and godliness and of true religion, to the love of God, to the patient suffering of afflictions, to prayer, to thanksgiving, and to the exercise of charity towards all men." And again, "The tree must be first and then the fruit. For the apples make not the tree, but the tree maketh the apples. So faith first maketh the person which afterwards bringeth forth works. Therefore to do the law without faith is to make the apples of wood and earth, without the tree; which is not to make apples but mere fancies. Contrariwise, if the tree be made, that is to say, the person or doer who is made through faith in Christ, works will follow. For the doer must needs be before the things which are done, and not the things which are done before the doer. The doer then is not so called of the things that are done, but of the things that are to be done. For Christians are not

made righteous in doing righteous things; but being now made righteous by faith in Christ, they do righteous things."

The motive is all-important. The glory of God is the only true motive in life. He says, "To give all glory to him is the wisdom of wisdoms, the righteousness of righteousness, the religion of religions, and the sacrifice of sacrifices." Even in philosophy we look not upon the bare work but the good will of the worker. And the Bible rewards are not promised to moral works, but to faithful works only. Faith is the divinity of works. "Reason must first be enlightened by faith before it can work. The true doing of the law is a faithful and spiritual doing. Therefore every perfunctory doer of the law and every holy moral worker is accursed. For he walketh in the presumption of him own righteousness against God, whilst he will be justified by man's free will and reason; and so in doing of the law, he doeth it not. Hypocrites do the law, and yet in doing it, they do it not."

Many hindrances remain, of course. "The remnants of sin still remain even in those that are justified; which, as they are contrary to faith, and hinder it, so do they hinder us from doing good works. Wherefore it is necessary that godly preachers should as diligently teach and urge the doctrine of good works as the doctrine of faith, for Satan is a deadly enemy to both. Notwithstanding, faith must first be planted; for without faith it is impossible to understand what a good work is, or what pleaseth God." And he concludes: "It is a hard and dangerous matter to teach that we are made righteous by faith without works, and yet to require works withal. Here, except the ministers of Christ be faithful and wise disposers of the mysteries of God, rightly dividing the word of truth, faith and works are by and by confounded. Both these doctrines, therefore, as well of faith as of works, must be diligently taught and urged; and yet so that both may remain within their bounds. Otherwise, if they teach works only, as they do in the Pope's kingdom, then is faith lost. If faith only be taught,

then carnal men by and by dream that works be not needful."

To Luther, as to St. Paul, there was but one gospel, *εὐαγγέλιον*, that which came through revelation from God: a gospel which was supernaturally communicated to men, and not one which could be learned from men or gotten by study through the diligence or wisdom of men. Two words, indeed, comprehend in them whatsoever belongeth to such a people. grace and peace: grace, signifying the remission of sins, and peace affording a quiet and joyful conscience. These two make a man strong so that he can neither be cast down with adversity nor puffed up with prosperity.

Jesus Christ in Martin Luther's gospel was the Son of a Virgin, a precious pearl, a diamond, one drop of whose blood is more precious than the whole world; not a tyrant, as the Schoolmen would make him, but a Saviour, not a mere lawgiver but a giver of grace; very God and very man, the only medium, or lens, through which we can see God and know his will; in whom we all are one, so that there is no difference or inequality of persons, neither Jew nor Greek.

And a Christian to Luther is one who has put on Christ (Gal. iii. 27), i.e., one who has experienced a new birth and has become a new creature, a child of grace and of the remission of sins; "yet one who is both righteous and a sinner, both holy and profane, an enemy of God and yet a child of God, not one who hath no sin, but he to whom God imputeth not his sin through faith in Christ; in brief, one who inwardly believes and outwardly works." A Christian must preach the Gospel. Christians, however, in a sense are madmen to endanger themselves by preaching the gospel; thus raising offences and procuring unto themselves the hatred and enmity of the whole world. For "it is not the Gospel, if it be preached in peace". According to the world's estimate, Christians of all men are the most pestilent and pernicious. Christ, however, in his Sermon on the

Mount, comforteth his disciples who should be reviled and persecuted for righteousness' sake. And as long as the Church teacheth the Gospel it must suffer persecution. He says, "Whoso will not suffer the persecution of Ishmael, let him not profess himself to be a Christian. There is nothing that more stirreth up the devil than the preaching of the Gospel." Nevertheless "the more the world rageth against the Gospel, the more the Gospel prospereth and goeth happily forwards". "The doctrine of faith is the doctrine of the cross." "So long as we breathe," says Luther, "we must endure the persecutions of our adversaries, until Christ comes from heaven; who, we hope, will come shortly as a just Judge to take vengeance of all those that obey not the Gospel." Luther longed for the final cataclysm. Near the time of his death he said, "God forbid that the world should last fifty years longer; let him cut matters short with his last judgment." Melancthon put the "end" less than two hundred years from his time. Calvin's motto was, *Domine quousque?* "O Lord how long?"

On the other hand, though the Gospel involves sacrifice, it gives liberty, all the liberty we really possess. "Now, Christian liberty is the liberty purchased by Christ. It is a very spiritual thing, which the carnal man doth not understand (Rom. ix. 23). Such liberty is not the Emperor's liberty but Christ's; not the devil's, though the whole world seeketh his, but the liberty of the conscience, now in Christ and therefore free and quiet—an inestimable liberty, free from the wrath of God forever. Even death, the most mighty and most dreadful thing in all the world, is utterly vanquished in the conscience by this liberty of the Spirit. Christian liberty swalloweth up at once, and taketh quite away, that whole heap of evils, the law, sin, death, and God's wrath, and in stead thereof it placeth righteousness, peace, and everlasting life. Wherefore the majesty of this liberty is highly to be esteemed and diligently to be considered." "In the time of temptation to apply it to oneself, and to feel the excellency of his liberty and the fruit there-

of, is a harder matter than can be expressed. Let us learn, therefore, to magnify this our liberty purchased by Jesus Christ, the Son of God, with no other price than with his own blood, to deliver us, not from any bodily or temporal servitude, but from a spiritual and everlasting bondage under mighty and invincible tyrants, to wit, the law, sin, death, and the devil, and so to reconcile us unto God his Father. Such liberty is not a liberty given by the law but by Christ, a liberty not of the flesh, but of the Spirit." The Gospel, in short, is the power of God unto salvation.

From this somewhat extended, yet still incomplete, digest of the Epistle to the Galatians and of Luther's commentary upon it, it is evident how truly and also how accurately the great Reformer caught the spirit of the great Apostle; how vividly also he recognized that the circumstances prevailing in Paul's time corresponded to those of his own; and how effectively he adapted the Apostle's teaching and doctrine to the needs of the mediaeval Church; and how, on the basis of the New Testament, and of this Epistle in particular, he was able to fulminate so prodigiously and so successfully against the ecclesiastical abuses of his age. The Epistle to the Galatians accordingly, we may conclude, is no ordinary letter; it is no mere sermon; neither is it a cold, formal, academic treatise. It is rather, as Gloël calls it, "a sword-cut, delivered in the hour of greatest danger, by a combatant who is assaulted by determined foes". It was the result of a mighty conflict between ritual and life. To the Jews of Paul's day, the discarding of Mosaism doubtless seemed like discarding religion itself. To Paul, on the other hand, the introduction of rites and ceremonies into Christianity meant nothing less than the overthrow of the new faith.

As an expositor of the Epistle Luther achieved a noble victory. "The only fit commentator for Paul," says Coleridge, "was Luther." He was conversant with the original text, and was quite capable, despite the poor auxiliaries he possessed, to interpret the Apostle's inner thought. But

the preëminent and outstanding virtue of his commentary lies in the fact that he caught the real spirit of the Epistle and elucidated with singular clearness and force its deeper doctrinal and theological truth.

Is it asked, "Does the Epistle to the Galatians still live? Will it continue to occupy a conspicuous place in modern thought? Or will it be superseded by something better?" G. Stanley Hall would answer by substituting for the gospel as generally accepted, a psychological reinterpretation of Christianity, which he makes bold to call "a new Christianity"; because the new psychological type of Christianity will no longer require faith in miracles or in the supernatural Christ (cf. his *Jesus the Christ in the Light of Psychology*). The *Expository Times* for July, 1917, opens with an inquiry similar to our own. The editor asks, "Shall we ever again be able to preach the Pauline theology? The doctrine of Justification by Faith, for example. Has anyone preached on Justification by Faith since the war began?" and he answers, "We may as well ask, Shall we ever again be able to preach? For we cannot preach religion without preaching theology. Theology is religion preached. But we must preach theology with adaptation. We shall never again preach the theology of St. Paul *as our fathers preached it*. We must adapt it to our own generation. And in adapting the preaching of the Pauline theology to our own time we must make ourselves acquainted with such discoveries as have been here made in it." And he adds, "Justification by Faith was itself a discovery in Luther's day."

Perhaps we shall not preach the great doctrine of Justification by Faith exactly "as our fathers" did, but if Bancroft is correct, "the principle of justification by faith alone brought with it the freedom of individual thought and conscience against authority". Perhaps we shall not preach it "as our fathers" did, but if Henry Ward Beecher was right, "our civil liberty is the result of the open Bible which Luther gave us."² Perhaps we shall not preach it "as our

² The first Bible in a European language ever printed in the U. S. was Luther's translation, 1743.

fathers" did, but if Daniel Webster at Bunker Hill, on June 17, 1843, spoke the truth, "the Reformation of Luther introduced the principle of civil liberty into the wilderness of North America." And according to Bishop Thorold of Rochester, England, in 1883, "the free millions of the United States may well rise up and do Luther honor by cherishing his example, pondering his history, and maintaining his creed". Perhaps not "as our fathers" did, but as a noted Unitarian clergyman, Dr. Frederic H. Hedge, a graduate of Harvard, has said, "To Martin Luther, above all men, we Anglo-Americans are indebted for national independence and mental freedom." Perhaps not "as our fathers" did, but as Charles Dudley Warner is quoted by Dr. Preserved Smith as saying, "Every man in Western Europe and in American is leading a different life today from what he would have led had Martin Luther not lived." Perhaps not "as our fathers" did, but as a noted Frenchman, Charles François Dominique de Villers says, "The Republic of America is a corollary of the Reformation." Perhaps we shall not preach the theology of St. Paul exactly "as our fathers" did, but as Godet long-ago fittingly observed, "This Epistle marks an epoch in the history of man, and is the ever precious document of his spiritual emancipation."

So long, therefore, as men believe that they are justified by faith, so long will the Epistle to the Galatians live and its truth be proclaimed.

GEORGE L. ROBINSON.

McCormick Theological Seminary.

SOME ECONOMIC RESULTS OF THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION DOCTRINES

The celebration this year of the Four Hundredth Anniversary of the Inauguration of the Protestant Reformation calls to mind the many sided character of the great revolt. It has been regarded from many angles and interpreted from many different points of view. Of these the most recent, and certainly not the least interesting, is the attempt to articulate the doctrines of the Reformation with the marked industrial acceleration in Europe which followed their formulation.¹ Whether or not we accept the economic conclusions to which the argument leads, the connection is at least suggestive, and this reason justifies an effort to appraise one of the dynamic forces of the Reformation after it has operated for four centuries.

The approach can be made best by examining for their economic content the essential elements of the two great systems of Reformation doctrine, the Lutheran and the Calvinistic. Luther's personal teachings had a great importance in themselves. They are direct and, depending upon what he himself thought, are relatively easy to weigh, inasmuch as their main tendencies were manifested within his lifetime. The economic forces bound up in the teachings of Calvin, on the other hand, did not reveal themselves at once, and it was not until the seventeenth century that their main trend became apparent. For this reason Luther's familiar personal views on the economic questions of his day properly precede a more extended discussion of the economic aspect of Calvinism. Lutheranism and Calvinism are alike in laying emphasis on industry; in their

*This article does not claim originality in anything but form. The reader may not feel inclined to accept the position assumed by the writer, to be sure, but the sources of information which he has followed are readily accessible and easily examined.

¹For example Professor Max Weber's profound analysis in his "Protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Capitalismus," *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozial Politik*, vol. xx, pp. 1-54; xxi, pp. 1-110., and Werner Sombart's *Quintessence of Capitalism*, pp. 222-267.

broad tendencies they differ only in the degree with which they break absolutely with the past. They break with the past, indeed, yet a profound industrial change did not immediately result from the formulation of Protestant doctrines. What occurred was this: the great economic forces of modern life had been taking form in the towns generations before Luther's birth, but these forces did not operate in harmony with the prevailing religious belief but in opposition to it, for the Roman Church consistently discouraged intensive industry and extended commercialism, and material progress, such as the great Italian and German cities displayed, was won only in the face of at least the formal disapproval of the Church. The doctrinal systems of the Reformers, on the other hand, exerted their pressure with, instead of against, the growing demands of industry.

I

When Luther's inquiry into the basis for the Pope's authority to grant indulgences led him to reject the sacramental system of the Roman Church which included the sacrament of penance and priestly absolution he was compelled to assert that there was no longer need for a priestly caste to administer it; and his dictum, "Every man is a priest," necessarily meant the abolition of those external marks of the priesthood which distinguished them from the laity,—their peculiar dress, their official language, their celibate relation to society, their exemption from taxation and from the jurisdiction of the secular courts,—and finally, it logically led to the abolition of the endowed position of the clergy. This landed endowment, which was an outcome not only of the sacerdotal system and its needs but also of the doctrine of good works, operated to maintain large numbers of the clergy in comparative idleness. Like a modern standing army, supported by the industry of the non-military class, the sacerdotal system drew many men from productive industrial pursuits and at the same time assured to the priests and monks protection and maintenance for life.

Yet the surrender of these Church lands to the great territorial princes, which the Reformation brought about, produced effects more immediately apparent in the political than in the economic sphere. For the uprisings of the peasant cultivators of the soil, inspired by the new doctrines, were fruitless; they brought the peasantry no betterment of condition, and agricultural life went on much as before. When, therefore, great numbers of priests and monks were thrown out on the world and were compelled to become economically productive, agriculture absorbed only a limited number of them. It was the towns that took up the excess, and it was in the towns that the spirit of industry joined most intimately with the new religious philosophy. In the towns, too, the differences between the old and the new were sharpened with every significant industrial advance. For while the economic life of the middle ages was intimately interwoven with the teachings of the Church, it must be repeated that logically the mediaeval Church in its teachings was antagonistic to business prosperity, inasmuch as the admonitions of the Church against the sin of avarice made the squandering of wealth a laudable virtue. The ideal knight of the middle ages, for example, as well as the great churchman spent inordinately.⁴ Then, also, the Church in its discouraging attitude toward labor for gain, in its exalted praise of voluntary poverty, its approval of begging, and its early prohibitions of interest insisted that wealth was much better given away than kept. All of this systematically discouraged both economy and industrial effort.

It is apparent that each of these teachings had its separate and cumulative economic effect. It is equally evident that not the least difficult task which Luther and the other reformers had to perform, although they were quite un-

² For an old, though exhaustive, treatment of the attitude of the Church on this subject see Dr. W. Endemann's article, "Die national-ökonomischen Grundsätze der canonistischen Lehre," especially pp. 31-48, in *Hildebrand's Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie*, Vol. i.

³ Neumann, *Geschichte des Wuchers*, pp. 1-38.

⁴ See Sombart, *Quintessence of Capitalism*, pp. 18-22.

conscious of its importance, was to formulate some kind of economic philosophy that would be consistent with the new dogmatic system of individual responsibility and at the same time in harmony with the economic tendencies of the age. They were, of course, concerned primarily with a scheme of salvation, and gave little or no attention to the formulation of a comprehensive economic system; nevertheless, embodied in their doctrines were very definite industrial principles.

Luther and Lutheranism succeeded only partly in formulating a satisfactory substitute for the economic philosophy of the mediaeval Catholic Church. Calvin and Calvinism, however, did work out a scheme looking at once to a plan of salvation and to a consistent, adequate and acceptable reconciliation of spiritual and material achievement. But Calvin and Luther were in agreement on one vital point, and that was that it was time for every one to get to work; and their common attitude toward industry is so opposed to the teachings of the mediaeval Church as to deserve careful consideration.

The Church had taught that labor is not a duty. On the contrary it earnestly commended a life of contemplation. Far better to remain poor than to devote oneself to useful productive labor either of a material or intellectual character. The chief concern of a man is the observances of religion. Anything that draws away from this employment is a waste of precious time. Labor of any kind is a concession to the necessities of life only.⁵ This view is consonant with the mediaeval conception of good works; and Luther could not attack the doctrine of good works without overthrowing the philosophy of life which stood behind it.

One result of applying this teaching literally appeared

⁵ Ward, "Darstellung und Würdigung der Ansichten Luther's von Staat und seine Wirtschaftlichen Aufgaben," pp. 47-51, in *Conrad's Sammlung nationalökonomischer und statistischer Abhandlungen*, Jena, 1898. The writer has made a liberal use of Ward's excellent article in presenting Luther's economic views. But see on this point Sombart, p. 18-14.

in the vast amount of idleness and begging which during the Reformation and before it was the occasion of so much shiftlessness and industrial apathy. A contemporary of Luther's, Eberlin von Gunzberg, says, for example, that there is so little money in the country because only one man in fifteen works, the rest loaf.⁶ Another contemporary, Sebastian Frank, says that it is a wonder that Germany supports herself at all, since not half or a third even of the population are at work.^{6a} Luther assails these idlers with his usual vigor. "No one wants to work," he says, "therefore employers of labor must grant holidays. When these laboring people are thus free no one may coerce them. There is great complaint how disobedient, faithless, illbred and profitless they are." They are "a curse from God" he comments.⁷

Not only did employers of labor grant holidays, but the Church required them of everyone, at various times during the year, possibly in the interest of the laborer, certainly to the detriment of industry.⁸ A striking illustration of the relation which working days bore to holidays is to be found in the conditions of the mining industry in Bavaria during the sixteenth century. In one case out of a total of two hundred and eight days, only one hundred and twenty-three were working days; in another, out of one hundred and sixty-one days, ninety-nine were working days; in a third, out of two hundred and eighty-seven days,

⁶ Schmoller, "Zur Geschichte der nationalökonomischen Ansichten Deutschlands während der Reformationsperiode," in *Tübinger Zeitschrift*, p. 481. Cited by Ward, p. 47.

^{6a} The same.

⁷ *Luther's Werke*, Erlanger Edition, Vol. xx, p. 272 f. Cited by Ward, p. 48.

⁸ "All Saints days (festivals) should be abolished, and Sunday alone be retained. . . . The reason is this: the feast days are now abused by drinking, gaming and idleness, and all manner of sins. . . . Over and above the spiritual injury the common man receives two material injuries appear; he neglects his work, and spends more than at other times, nay also he weakens his body and is unfit for work." *Luther's Address to the Christian Nobility*, p. 127. Edit. C. M. Jacobs Luth. Theol. Seminary.

one hundred and ninety-three were working days.⁹ The effect of a contempt for productive labor, the praise accorded to an indifference to material interests and the frequent compulsory Church holidays revealed itself in the manifold losses to agriculture, among other industries, which reduced the material output of the land to the minimum. Luther, brought up as a peasant, saw this clearly enough but his attack was directed not against the economic waste, but against the immorality to which this idleness led.

It will be plain, in view of the apathy prevailing at that time toward labor, that if there was to be any future economic progress some one must come out positively in favor of continuous labor as a moral duty. This Luther did. It is generally conceded that it was his great, though unconscious, economic achievement to have restored labor to its proper dignity by his religious teaching.¹⁰ But here, as elsewhere, Luther expressed his age. For artisan labor had begun to assume dignity many generations before Luther's time in every town where there was a craft guild, in the trading centers where a man's importance was very largely determined by his position in the industrial system. Luther's interest was ethical and not economic. In fact he approaches the whole question from the doctrinal side. Nevertheless the results are economic. The bed rock of his teaching is the scriptural command: "In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat thy bread." "Labor," he says, "is not only not forbidden, but it is urgently enjoined."¹¹ Economically significant, too, is Luther's teaching that a man should work at his calling, for the idea of a vocation is new, and does not appear before the Reformation. Every kind or any kind of labor in accordance with the divine command is endorsed by Luther, but to him, in contrast with the Calvinistic idea, labor was undifferentiated. A

⁹ H. Peetz, *Volkswissenschaftliche Studien* (1885), p. 186 f., cited in Sombart's *Quintessence of Capitalism*, p. 19.

¹⁰ Ward, p. 48; see also, J. A. Faulkner's article, "Luther and Economic Questions," *Lutheran Quarterly*, Vol. xli, pp. 387-402.

¹¹ *Erlang. Edit.* Vol. v., p. 93. Ward, p. 48.

man might milk a cow to the glory of God.^{11a} "Indeed," he says, "Christ does not inquire whether you are a man or a woman, an emperor or a groom. You should obey God in whatsoever position in life you are and not refrain from labor."¹² His main argument for continuous industry was in harmony with his dogma of individual responsibility, inasmuch as it insisted that the individual should live by his own exertions upon the results of his own labors. Hence his contempt for the monks "who are nourished by others." "Choose some labor," he says further, "in order that you may eat your bread in the sweat of your brow," for this is the proper application of the command, "Thou shalt not steal."¹³ When it is remembered what a crowd of idlers and beggars there were, it is obvious what a disturbing significance this doctrine must have had and what hostility it must have aroused.

The essence of Luther's views on the necessity for labor is, indeed, its moral significance; but in place of economically useless good and holy works of piety, and economically demoralising almsgiving, by means of which one sought to obtain salvation, Luther would substitute the useful labor of productive industry.¹⁴ Not, it must be noted, because it was necessary to the State,—that was a later gospel,—nor because it was productive, but because labor was in itself good. Thus Luther insisted with Calvin,¹⁵ that the essential thing was not good works, but good work—good, in his conception, because it served some one else. Good works thus became for him service rendered to God; good work, service rendered to his fellow man. This idea he

^{11a} *Omnia enim per te operabitur (Deus) mulgebit per te vaccam et servillissima quaeque opera faciet, ac maxima pariter et minima ipsi grata erunt.* (Exegese der Genesis, op. lat. exeg. ed, Elsperger, VII, 213.) Cited in Weber, xx. 43.

¹² *Erlang. Edit.*, Vol. i, p. 250. Ward, p. 49.

¹³ *Erlang. Edit.*, Vol. ix, p. 319. Ward, p. 50.

¹⁴ See Ward, p. 49.

¹⁵ "Good works, in a proper comprehensive sense, are all actions internal and external that are morally good, but in a narrow acception, they are works not only formally good, but materially good." Richard Baxter's *Christian Directory*, p. 128, par. 2.

illustrates several times. "We do not need to perform labor for God but for our neighbors," he says in one place;¹⁶ in another, "it is a matter of indifference whether you build any more churches, so long as you are useful to your neighbors."¹⁷

It is not surprising to find that Luther's attitude toward marriage, his pleasure in good company and his admonitions to enjoy the good things which God has given, place him in definite opposition to asceticism.¹⁸ There is, moreover, a very vital connection between the ascetic ideal of life and the lack of stimulus to industry. For, if it is sinful for the body to enjoy the results of labor, why expend more effort than the minimum necessary to sustain life? Or why work at all? Why not beg? To this question Luther makes a double answer; first, the body, so far from allowing its animal vigor to be depleted by fasts and vigils and the results of voluntary poverty, must be kept in healthy condition by a moderate amount of physical labor, and here he stands with the Humanists; secondly, the highest end of labor is service.¹⁹ Incidentally, the attitude of indifference to efforts directed toward bodily comfort, which prevailed in the middle ages and which asceticism encouraged, and its attendant discouragement of cleanliness of person and surroundings, must have led to a general toleration of unsanitary conditions which invited the plague. In this way asceticism may be charged, properly, with contributing to the economic losses due to the ravages of the pestilence. Cleanliness was not next to godliness, but was opposed to godliness, until the hold of the extreme ascetic ideal had been weakened.^{19a}

Luther discouraged the taking of interest. He generally

¹⁶ *Erlang. Edit.*, Vol. xiii, p. 179. Ward, p. 49.

¹⁷ *Erlang. Edit.*, Vol. xli, p. 159. Ward, p. 49.

¹⁸ See Ward, p. 46.

¹⁹ See Ward, p. 49.

^{19a} The proverb itself, whenever it originated, must have formulated a revolutionary doctrine, and it would be extremely interesting to know whether it appeared at all before the Reformation. Certainly the rat flea in its relation to the Black Death is a definite economic factor.

held, with the mediaeval Church, that interest was ethically indefensible.²⁰ The economic result of this attitude was to hamper the use of capital and the growth of business. Curiously enough, his reasons for objecting to usury and interest were identical with his reasons for approving continuous labor; the significant thing in each case was the moral effect upon the individual who practised it. The question arose inevitably. Luther's negative attitude toward free almsgiving, and his insistence that every one should work, implied economy and the accumulation of capital; but how might this surplus capital be used? Might a good Christian lawfully take interest on a loan? Luther wrote a good deal on this subject.²¹ But he was first of all a peasant and then a monk, and it is not surprising that his thought was obscure and his conclusions vacillating on the subject of interest and the employment of capital. At first Luther was positive and definite in his opposition, but toward the close of his life he wavered as to whether it might not be permissible on certain occasions. Yet he remained true to the principle that the question was to be determined wholly by ethical considerations. For example, he explains that it is wrong to take interest because it enables a man to get something without working for it, and this is morally bad. One or two citations will make his position clear. Explaining the text from Luke vi, 30, "Give

²⁰ Endemann's *Die nationalökonomischen Grundsätze*, p. 31 f. Ward, p. 62.

²¹ Sermon on *Wucher*, *Erlang. Edit.*, Vol. xx, pp. 89-122; on *Kaufshandlung und Wucher*, Vol. xxii, pp. 199-226, and in Otto Clemens edit. *Luthers Werke*, Bd. III; *An die Pfarrherrn wider den Wucher zu predigen*, *Erlang. Edit.*, Vol. xxiii, pp. 282-338. For an analysis of Luther's attitude see Neumann's *Geschichte des Wuchers*, pp. 480 f. Calvin's approval of interest is found in Neumann, *Gesch. d. Wuchers*, pp. 492 ff. In the *Corpus Reformatorum*, XXXVIII, pars prior, pp. 247 f. (Ward, 71-2), Calvin laid down seven principles for the regulation of interest. While he had much in common with Luther, Calvin stood in direct opposition to the position of the mediaeval Church on the subject of interest. In a large measure the industrial progress made by the Calvinists may be ascribed to Calvin's penetration in endorsing interest as ethically defensible.

to every man that asketh, and from him that taketh away thy goods ask them not again," Luther says: "We should willingly lend or borrow without additional payment or interest." Again, when a poor man is forced by necessity to borrow, the injunction applies: "Ye shall lend and expect nothing in return" "and," he continues, "they too are usurers, who, lending wine, corn, money, or anything of the kind, pledge a return in a year or any fixed time for interest, or constrain them to return more or something better than they have borrowed." "Such conduct," he goes on, "is an offense against the principle of neighborliness, as well as against the Scripture: 'Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them.'²² Yet in 1519, in answer to the question as to how much interest a man might lawfully take, Luther concedes four or five gulden in the hundred, "but," he insists, "the less in the hundred the more Godlike and Christlike it is."²³ Luther had a simple agricultural community in mind, and he knew nothing of the law of supply and demand. With antiquity and the mediaeval Church he held money to be sterile and, since it was before the time when capital could be employed in Germany for large industrial enterprises, he was perhaps justified in viewing the man who loaned money at interest as a kind of pawnbroker who wrung profit from the abject necessity of his neighbor. Nevertheless, this attitude left Luther's dogmatic system just so far out of harmony with the economic tendencies of his age.

These more or less familiar economic bearings of Luther's teaching may be summed up in brief form: (1) in order that the individual may eat his bread in the sweat of his brow he opposes begging, free almsgiving, and voluntary poverty; (2) because labor is morally good and leads to service he endorses and preaches industry, accepting its economical results in frugality and accumulation of property; (3) he rejects the ascetic ideal of life and thereby

²² *Erlang. Edit.*, Vol. xx, pp. 104 f. Ward, 64.

²³ *Erlang. Edit.*, Vol. xx, p. 117. Ward, p. 69.

furnishes a further motive to labor for the gratification of the demands of the body; (4) although he recognises the right of the individual to accumulate wealth, he is generally opposed to interest, first, because it does not require labor, again, because it is a means of oppressing one's neighbor; (5) his dogmatic system is in harmony with the economic tendencies of his age in part only; nowhere does Luther reconcile the bending of every effort to the accumulation of wealth through industry with the highest type of Christian endeavor. That was left for the Calvinism of the seventeenth century.²⁴

II

The question as to why Calvinism exerted a profound influence upon the economic life of Christendom is not easily answered, since it involves a fundamental philosophy of life. The problem may be formulated in this way: If the question should be asked of the age before Luther, "What after all is the object of life? To what end should the best energies of mind and body, and the physical resources of nature be directed?" the Church would have to answer: The purpose of this life is to attain heaven and to escape hell in the world to come. The best means to this end is the ascetic life of contemplation in the monastery. The natural resources of the world, with its opportunity for riches, should be used to satisfy the essential demands of nature and to accumulate property only that the contemplative life may be possible. To labor to get rich, to charge interest on money, to take more than the just price, or to work on fast days and Church holidays is contrary to the ethical teachings of the Church.

If, on the other hand, the question were put to the modern age: To what best use should the physical resources of nature and the mental endowment of man be put, the answer would have to be: every ounce of energy, every

²⁴ The most satisfactory record of Calvinistic ethics in the seventeenth century is Richard Baxter's *Christian Directory*. The references that follow are to the folio edition, London, 1673.

moment of time, every consideration of comfort, of leisure, of recreation, of health even, must be devoted to the main occupation of life, to the pursuit of business in the warehouse, the factory or the office, to the exploiting of every possible resource of nature by every available appliance of science or machinery. Why? The best justification which the age offers is that all this activity and energy in some way serves the public welfare. It is the doctrine of service, and the great benefactions of multi-millionaires to universities, libraries, hospitals and to public institutions in general is the tribute which they pay to the force of this idea as to the proper use of wealth.

To the question as to why business is carried on with such irrational intensity, the answer would have to be made: we do not know why. It is the spirit of the age into which we are born. Mankind instead of serving his own ends in a rational use of his time has become the creature of a system that uses him for something else.

Just how the ideals of one age came to supplant those of another it is not possible to describe, but unquestionably it involves the relation of religion to secular occupations, and to such degree that a discussion of the economic influence of Calvinism must rest on the assumption that religious forces have given shape to the industrial spirit of past ages. The political and economic effects of carrying out programs of ethical reform are always incidental and unforeseen, but they appear as forces in history, and do so in spite of the fact that the chief concern of the reformers has been something quite other than economic results.

Beyond doubt there is a large element of asceticism in the spirit of modern industrial life. Just as the monk gave up certain things, desirable in themselves, in order that his spiritual life might prosper, the modern business man, who boasts that he never takes a vacation and who is at work before his clerks, gives up certain things to this spirit of business long after the need for sacrifice has been removed by success.

Assuming some such starting point as this, it is possible to trace the essentially ascetic element in modern business life in its self-denial and self-discipline for business ends, back through ascetic Methodism and Calvinism into the mediaeval monastery, side by side with the idea that one of the ends of labor is public service as the essence of Christian charity.²⁵

The bearers of Protestant asceticism are four: Calvinism, in the form which it took on in the regions which it dominated in the seventeenth century; Pietism in Germany; Methodism in the eighteenth century; and the Baptists. No one of these is sharply opposed to the rest. Pietism gradually merges with Lutheranism in the seventeenth century in Germany. The Calvinists and Baptists in the beginning are roughly separated one from the other, but in the seventeenth century they gradually approach, and in the independent sects in England and Holland they are but a step apart.

Admittedly, similar ethical maxims may be united with very dissimilar dogmatic beliefs, and in considering these four forms of ascetic Protestantism it is safe to disregard both dogmatic differences and ethical teachings and to confine ourselves to the actual moral practice of everyday life.

The ascetic Protestant sects were practically identical in ethical ideals. They all believed in the inevitable character of retribution to the unsaved. But in answer to the vital question: How may I know that I am saved from damnation, all but the Calvinists replied that subjective experiences are safe assurances of the fact that the sinner is at peace with God. Conversion for the Methodists; the Pietistic ecstasy of communion with God; the inner light of the Quakers; all are alike in principle. From these emotional experiences of regeneration proceed the desire for

²⁵ The argument from here on is based upon Max Weber's "Die Protestantische Ethik," already mentioned, and the reader is referred to volumes xx and xxi of the *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozial Politik* for Professor Weber's very admirable treatment of the whole question.

a holy life and the impulse to manifest by their works the fact that they have been born again. All, like Calvinism, laid emphasis on the ethical significance of work at a given calling for the glory of God. The Calvinist insisted, however, that no subjective test was valid; that all these emotional experiences were shared in common with the unregenerate, and might be illusions of the devil; and that, while there was no external sign by which the elect might be known from the reprobate, the elect would inevitably produce the works that were the signs of election. This objective test would be the best evidence of a state of grace. The elect would be sure to manifest a state of grace in the practice of the virtues that tended to further the glory of God on earth: industry, economy, perseverance, determined purpose, and the self-denial of comfort, leisure, recreation, and culture for the advancement of God's glory.²⁶ These are essentially the industrial virtues. The reprobate, on the other hand, would manifest the corresponding traits that did not carry forward the glory of God: laziness, wastefulness of time and money, irresolution, self-indulgence in leisure and bodily comfort.²⁷ They, too, would be known

²⁶ "Your lives must be laid out in doing God's service, and in doing all the good you can, with prudence, fidelity, industry, zeal and delight, remembering that you are engaged to God as servants to their lord and master, and are entrusted with his talents, of the improvements whereof you must give account." Richard Baxter's *Christian Directory*, p. 128, par. 10.

"God looketh not only, or principally, on the external part of the work . . . nor at the length of time, but at the sincerity and diligence of his servants. . . . p. 129, par. 13.

" . . . in mowing or in whetting, in travelling, or in baiting to fit us for travel; and so our time of sleep and feeding and needful recreation is laid out for God." " . . . above all by diligence; that we still be doing and put forth all our strength and run as for our lives, and whatever our hand shall find to do do it with our might." "Time must be saved from the hands of and at the expense of sinful pleasures, sports, and revellings; natural sleep must be parted with when it is necessary to save time." p. 275, par. 6.

²⁷ "Tomorrow is the sluggard's working day. He lieth in bed or sitteth idly and wisheth would this were laboring; he feasteth his flesh, and wisheth, would this were fasting; he followeth sports and

by their fruits. The social or business activity of the Calvinist in the world, therefore, is simply work for the greater glory of God. The labor of one's calling takes on the character of service for the whole of temporal life.

Charity, or brotherly love, expresses itself in the first place in the performance of the labor of one's calling as this is determined by the law of nature, that is, the demand for sustenance, and consequently it assumes an impersonal character, that of service toward a rational shaping of the world in accordance with the divine plan. This partnership of the elect with God in carrying out his plans for the world and for humanity is best manifested in serving the needs and uses of the human race. Thus, service in satisfying social needs is to be recognized as labor for the advancement of God's glory and in accordance with His will.²³

pleasures and wisheth, would this were prayer and mortified life; he setteth his heart on pride or lust and wisheth would this were heavenly mindedness and laying up treasure above."

"As the door turneth upon his hinges so doth the slothful upon his bed." Prov. 26, 14.

"Yea when he is in duty the slothful is still losing time. He prayeth as if he prayed not, and laboreth not, as if the fruits of holiness passed as quickly away as the worldly pleasures."

"I went by the field of the slothful, and by the vineyard of the man void of understanding, and lo it was all grown over with thorns, and nettles had covered the face thereof, and the stone wall thereof was broken down. Then I saw and considered it well. I looked upon it and received instruction. Yet a little sleep, a little slumber, a little folding of the hands in sleep. So shall thy poverty come as one that travelleth and thy want as an armed man." Prov. 24:30-34. Baxter's *Christian Directory*, p. 288.

²³ "The first and principle thing to be attended to in the choice of a trade or calling is in the service of God and the public good, and therefore that calling which most conduceth to the public good is to be preferred." *Chn. Direct.*, p. 449, par. 21.

"After the public good and God's service it is lawful for you to look to the profitableness of your calling."

"Public service is God's greatest service." p. 133, par. 26.

"It is for action that God maintaineth us and our abilities. It is in action that God is most served and honored, not so much by our being able to do good as by our doing it." p. 448, par. 7-8.

"The public welfare or the good of the many is to be valued above our own. Every man therefore is bound to do all the good he can

The source of the utilitarian character of the Calvinistic as of the Lutheran ethics lies here. Labor at one's calling, or business, becomes a means to self-discipline and to self-control. By his very conception of life and eternity the Calvinist must know that his calling is the one in which by its results he will especially succeed in advancing the glory of God. In every affair of daily life, no matter how trivial, he is compelled to meet the question: Am I one of the elect? How will this particular action give best evidence that I am working out God's purposes? It will certainly bear the evidence of His approval by its success. How best make it succeed?

This relation of each plan and each action to the whole scheme of life inevitably led to a most careful consideration of every performance and every impulse as to its ultimate bearing, and it thus led to an ordered, rational arranging of every relation in life with this one end in view.

It is suggestive to compare the somewhat hand-to-mouth system of occasional performances on the part of the mediaeval Catholic Christian with the ordered and purposed performances of the whole being of the Calvinist. The ethical practice of the everyday man is disclosed in its lack of plan and system. It is shaped by Calvinism for the entire conduct of life into an organised method, with its resulting specialised and intensified labor for each man.

Calvin did not see in the acquisition and possession of riches any hindrance to the spirit.²⁹ Not riches but the enjoyment of them was to be guarded against. Not the

to others especially for the church and the commonwealth." p. 448, par. 9.

²⁹ "After the public good and God's service it is lawful to look to the profitableness of your calling."

"For though it is said, Labor not to be rich, the meaning is not to make riches your chief end; riches for our fleshly ends must not ultimately be intended or sought. But in subordination to higher things they may. That is, you may labor in that manner which tendeth most to your success and lawful gain." *Chn. Dir.*, p. 450, par. 24.

"You may labor to be *rich for God* though not for the flesh and sin." p. 450, par. 24.

lifelong labor in getting them, but the resting in contentment in their possession. For the saint's everlasting rest was rest in the hereafter when the long day's work was done; on earth man must work the work of Him that sent him while it is yet day in order to assure himself of a state of grace.

Nothing embodies this idea better than the good Calvinistic hymn, "Work, for the night is coming." Work, indeed. Heaven was to be one long Sabbath of rest; and it is perhaps not too much liberty to take with the long, long sermons which our forefathers heard so patiently, to assume that they could always be applied to everyday business affairs with profit. Not indolence but performance,³⁰ according to the plainly revealed will of God. Valueless, and therefore to be despised is the unproductive contemplative life. In the Calvinistic system there is no place for monasteries, nor for begging friars. For poverty is a condition as little to be proud of as sickness or deformity. Work is the means of realizing spiritual life, but besides this, and above all this, work is the proper condition of life. Calvin and Luther unite here.

This doctrine was held by Thomas Aquinas,^{30a} and it is found in the monasteries, but with this difference, namely, that work was rendered necessary by natural law for the sustenance of the individual and of society; when this end

³⁰ "God hath work for us to do, and He will require it of us." *Chm. Dir.*, p. 128, par. 2.

"Thus we must be judged according to our works and to be judged is nothing else but to be justified or condemned." p. 129, par. 4.

"Take pleasure in your work, and then you will not be slothful in it." p. 455, par. 34.

"To this end be sure to do all your work as that which God requireth of you and that which He hath promised to reward; and believe His acceptance of your meanest labors, which are done in obedience to his will." p. 455, par. 35.

"Call yourselves daily or frequently to account how you spend your time and what work you do and how you do it." p. 455, par. 39.

^{30a} A comprehensive treatment of the attitude of Thomas Aquinas toward labor is found in Max Maurenbrecher's *Thomas von Aquino's Stellung zum wirtschaftsleben seiner Zeit*. Leipzig, 1898, pp. 63-75.

was attained the need ceased. This mediaeval doctrine did not apply to any one who was able to live without work, and this is the great difference in the conceptions of the two systems.

But the providential purpose of the organisation of the various occupations is, true to the Calvinistic scheme, to be judged by its fruits. "He shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water, which bringeth forth his fruit in his season. His leaf also shall not wither, and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper. The ungodly are not so. . . ."

In its purely economic aspect, the specialisation of occupations, or callings, led to a qualitative and quantitative increase in the performance of labor, because it raised to a maximum the skill of the worker.³¹ As to its material profitableness, if God, whom the Puritans saw guiding all the affairs of everyday life, showed to one of his saints an opportunity for gain, God had his own inscrutable purpose back of it, and the believing Christian had to follow this call while he profited by it. "If God shows you a way by which you can make money in a lawful way, without harm to your own soul, or to someone else, rather than some other way, and you follow the path bringing you less gain, then you cross the aim and end of your calling and thus

³¹ "As labor is thus necessary, so understand how needful is a stated calling, for the right performance of your labors. A calling is a stated ordinary course of labor. This is very needful for these reasons: outside a calling a man's labors are but occasional, or unconstant, and so more time is spent in idleness than in labor. 2. A man is best skilled in that which he is used to. 3. And he will be best provided for it with instruments and necessities. 4. Therefore he doeth it better than he could do any other work, and so wrongeth not others, but attaineth more ends of his labor. 5. And he will do it more easily; when a man is unused, and unskilled, and unfurnished toileth himself much in doing little. 6. And he will do his work more orderly when another is in continual confusion, and his business knoweth not its time and place, but one part contradicts another. Therefore some certain calling or trade is best for every man." *Chn. Dir.*, p. 449, par. 15.

"It is not enough that you consider what calling and labor is most desirable but you must also consider what you and your children are fitteth for, both in mind and body." p. 450.

avoid being God's steward."³² "God blesseth his trade," is the ethical approval bestowed on the self-made man.

Nor was the unequal distribution of property any business of the Calvinist, who was never troubled with socialistic qualms. It was God's hidden purpose that property should be unequally distributed and this should not be pried into. Thus, the idea that his material prosperity was the measure of God's approval was not weakened by the thought that this must be shared with some one else who did not prosper so well. It was too much like almsgiving. Economically, it was an advantage to compel each man to depend upon his own efforts and thus lead to increased production by his labor.

Nor did the plan provide alone for those who acquired wealth. Baxter says, "If thou be called to the poorest laborious calling, do not carnally murmur at it because it is wearysome to the flesh, nor imagine that God accepteth less of thy work and of thee; but cheerfully follow it, and make it a matter of thy pleasure and joy that thou art still in thy heavenly Master's service, though it be about the lowliest things; and He that knoweth what is best for thee hath chosen this for thy good, and tryeth and valueth thy obedience to Him the more by how much the meaner work thou stoapest to do at His command."³³ The Calvinistic scheme placed before the elect no obstacle against exploiting for the spread of God's glory and the advancement of one's business this spirit of willingness on the part of other elect who lacked material evidence of God's blessing; and no better basis for industrial organisation can be found than this unity of purpose along with the spirit of subordination on the part of the laborer.

The economic aspect of Calvinism is further manifest in the idea of stewardship, so vital to Calvinism. Like the mediaeval monk, the Calvinist had nothing of his own. This idea laid its compelling hand on every interest of daily

³² *Chn. Dir.*, p. 450, par. 24.

³³ *Chn. Dir.*, p. 450, par. 27.

life. Unnecessary sleep,³⁴ games of recreation,³⁵ society,³⁶ unprofitable talk,³⁷ time taken in dressing,³⁸ and at long

³⁴ "The sinfulness of excess of sleep lieth in these particulars: 1. that it is a sinful wasting of every minute of that time which is consumed in it. And this is a very grievous thing, . . . when we think how short our lives are, and how great our work is to cast away any of this little time in needless sleep." *Chn. Dir.*, p. 404, par. 7.

"Rise early and go late to bed, and put thyself upon a necessity of diligence all the day; undertake and engage thyself in as much business as thou art able to go through, that if thou wouldst, thou mayest not be able to give any indulgence to the flesh." *Chn. Dir.*, p. 401.

"Excessive sleep," Baxter says, p. 404, "is anything over five hours for some, six for others."

³⁵ "All sport and enjoyment are to be as the mower whetting his scythe." *Chn. Dir.*, p. 460.

"All sports are unlawful which take up any part of the time which we should spend in greater works, . . . and all those that take up more time than the end of the recreation doth require." *Chn. Dir.*, p. 461. "Those sports are unlawful which occasion the multiplying of idle words about them," p. 461. "Too costly recreation also is unlawful. When you are but God's steward and must give account to Him for all you have, it is sinful to expend on sport needlessly," p. 461. "Another notorious Time-wasting thief, is needless, inordinate sports and games, which are commonly stigmatised by the offenders themselves with the infamous name of *Pastimes*; and are masked with the deceitful title of Recreations, such as are Cards and Dice, and Stage-plays, and Dancings and Revellings, . . . whether all these are lawful or unlawful in themselves is nothing to the present question, but I am sure that the precious hours which they take up, might have been improved to the saving of many thousand souls, that by the loss of time are now undone and past recovery." *Chn. Dir.*, p. 291.

³⁶ "Another thief which . . . would steal your time is vain and idle company." *Chn. Dir.*, p. 291.

"Another time wasting thief is unnecessary pomp and curiosity in attendance house, furniture, provision, and entertainments, together with excess of compliments and ceremony and servitude to the humors and expectation of time wasters. They are all wheels of the same engine. This unnecessary wasting of their precious time in compliment, pomp and curiosity the happy poor may spend in the honest labors of their callings. . . ." *Chn. Dir.*, p. 290.

³⁷ "Another Time wasting sin is idle talk: what abundance of precious time doth this consume: Harken to most men's discourse, when they are sitting together, or working together, or travelling together, and you shall hear how little of it is better than silence." *Chn. Dir.*, p. 290, par. 55.

³⁸ "Have you not better use for precious hours than to be wasting and pinning and dressing and curling and spotting and powdering

meals³⁹ were all condemned as a waste of time not his own. He was God's steward and would have to account for each minute. Nor might he spend on himself the property which he held for God. His dress must be sober,⁴⁰ his meals frugal,⁴¹ his dwelling simple.

This restraint placed on the enjoyment of the material world had the economic effect of checking consumption, particularly the consumption of luxuries; but more important, surely, was the religious approval of unremitting, systematic labor in his business as the highest means of spiritual discipline and at the same time the safest and most visible assurance of regeneration and the genuineness of his faith.

The effect of this limitation upon consumption together with an ethical endorsement of the striving for gain is plainly the formation of capital by means of economy.

Surely it is most significant that the exclusive striving for the kingdom of God through fulfilment of one's calling, and the strict discipline which the reformed churches taught, affected just those unpropertied classes which the productivity of labor in the capitalistic sense of the word most demanded. Certain it is, that it is not possible to harness to the machinery of labor such a mighty force as

until ten or eleven o'clock in the morning when honest laborers have done one half their days work," . . . "were not six o'clock in the morning better for you?" *Chn. Dir.*, p. 289, par. 52.

³⁹ To be avoided are needless and tedious feastings, gluttony and tippling. "Alas in this luxurious sensual age how commonly do men sit two hours at a feast, and not improving the time in any pious and profitable discourse. Yea, the rich spend an hour ordinarily in a common meal." *Chn. Dir.*, p. 290.

⁴⁰ "Be sure to avoid excess of costliness of apparel," p. 468, par. 15.

" . . . waste not your precious time in needless curiosity of dressing," p. 468, par. 16.

"Imitate the common sort of the grave and sober persons of your own rank," p. 468, par. 17.

"Your apparel should express your humiliation," p. 468, par. 20.

⁴¹ "Take heed of excess of meat, drink and sleep. . . . a full belly and a drowsy brain are unfit for work," p. 455, par. 32.

See also, pp. 370-380 in Baxter, on Gluttony.

this, or to let loose in history such a doctrine, without its producing decided and lasting economic results.

The wonderful efficiency and economy of Protestantism, finally, lies in the fact that it identified two elements in civilisation which had been united but once before in European history, and then in the case of Greece. These two elements are the spirit of religion and the spirit of possession of the material world. These two had been united or opposed as religion gave or withheld its sanction to business pursuits. Not the least result of this was that, with the adoption of the Protestant doctrines by part of Europe, poverty and riches, to a certain extent changed places as virtues, while, within considerable limitations the prosperous man replaced the beggar as a type of Christian excellence.

CHALFANT ROBINSON.

Princeton University.

REVIEWS OF RECENT LITERATURE

PHILOSOPHICAL LITERATURE

The Philosophy of Wang Yang-Ming. Translated from the Chinese by FREDERICK GOODRICH HENKE, PH.D., formerly Professor of Psychology and Philosophy in the University of Nanking. With an Introduction by Profesor James H. Tufts of the University of Chicago. Open Court Publishing Company, Chicago. 1916. Pp. XVII, 512. \$2.50.

This volume will attract not only the philosopher but also those interested in missionary work deeply enough to make the attempt to understand the thought of a great people to which our church is commending the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Wang Yang-Ming was a Chinese thinker who was born in 1472 and who died in 1529. The volume under review translates part of the literary work associated with his name. First is his biography (pp. 3-40) in which are detailed the events of his life that appealed to the Chinese mind as most important. He was a precocious genius. At the age of eleven he composed off hand a verse on the to us somewhat uninspiring topic, "The Mountain Hides the Moon." In his next year he astonished his teacher by the question, "What is the most important thing in life?" The teacher replied, "Study to be a Chinshih. (Ph.D.?) "No," replied the embryo philosopher, "to become a sage; that is the first and the greatest occupation." Wang did become a sage but evidently this did not preclude his gaining in succession all the various degrees. After three attempts he earned his Chinshih at the age of 28, and later the degree of Hanlin, the highest of all. He then entered the service of the government and during the rest of his life he combined the careers of philosopher and state official, proving to the world the truth of his assertion that to devote oneself to learning it is not necessary to have leisure. His last words were characteristic, "My mind is very bright and clear. What more is there to say?"

In addition to the "Biography" the volume contains a translation of the "Instructions for Practical Life" (pp. 47-140), the "Record of Discourses," (pp. 143-217), and the "Letters" (pp. 221-497). Of these the "Instructions for Practical Life" is most important because it contains the philosopher's system, recorded by one of his disciples, arranged by a second, and later revised by two others.

We are accustomed to the presentation of philosophic thought in logically sequent writing or speaking. It is, therefore, somewhat perplexing when we find Wang's thought presented in the form of

extended answers given to various questions asked by his disciples. While this method has all the charm of personal conversation, it shares its disconnected character, and makes the task of exposition somewhat uncertain. The reason is that one student may emphasize a certain feature of Wang's teaching and from it interpret the rest; while another student may emphasize a different feature and so reach an opposite opinion as to the main features of the teaching. Dr. Henke calls Wang an idealist of the monistic type; another scholar doubts this assertion because it gives Wang a consistent position at variance with his practical outlook. Our best plan, therefore, to arrive at an understanding of the main outlines of Wang's doctrine, is to notice what notions are oftenest repeated, and then to treat these as the cardinal points for a connected exposition of the system.

Following this method we soon come to notice that one of the most frequently used phrases is that of "intuitive faculty" and "intuitive knowledge." The former occupies in the system the place of "nous" in Plato and Aristotle, or "Reason" in Kant. The mind is "the embodiment of heaven given principles," the united functioning of which forms the "intuitive faculty," of which in turn the goal is "intuitive knowledge." This intuitive faculty is a treasure of the humble, the possession of which renders all men equal. It is capable of development and, in its development, consists the loftiest virtue. Wang's philosophy is an exposition of the functioning of the intuitive faculty.

In accord with the highly practical nature of Chinese thinking, intuitive knowledge is restricted almost entirely to the ethical and social spheres; scientific theory is almost entirely absent. This defect, nevertheless, has its advantages, since if Wang had devoted his activity to science his thought would have had slight interest for us today, but in his remarks on ethics and society he gives us an insight into a very present and practical matter when we remember the ever increasing closeness of relations between our land and the great nation across the Pacific.

Jesus Christ came not to destroy but to fulfill. This is true not only of the Old Testament law but also of a great deal of the world's thought outside of Christianity which in the hand of the skilful and well informed missionary may be used as a school master to lead to Christ. In the volume under review may be found a multitude of ethical discussions on all relations of life, some of which judged by Scriptural standards are excellent; others just as manifestly defective. Among the former are the assertions that knowledge and action form a unity; that selfish ends and passions stifle the mind, etc; among the latter are the notions that the individual is his own authority, that experience is life's only guide, that good and evil are not absolute but merely relative distinctions. But whether we can approve what we find or not, the evangelization of any nation demands that we know it and its way of thinking. The philosophy of Wang Yang-Ming is exert-

ing a strong influence not only on China but also on Japan, and is, therefore, worthy of serious study by all who are interested in the Christianization of these lands. To all such the translation of Dr. Henke may be recommended.

GEORGE JOHNSON.

Lincoln University, Pa.

APOLOGETICAL THEOLOGY

The Supernatural or Fellowship with God. By DAVID A. MURRAY, D.D., Author of "Christian Faith and the New Psychology," etc. 8 vo, pp. 311. New York, Chicago, Toronto, London and Edinburgh: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1917.

The other work of our author, "Christian Faith and the New Psychology", was reviewed somewhat at length in the number of this Review for Jan. 1912. All that was then said applies equally and specially to the book now under consideration. Both would mediate between modern thought and evangelical theology. Both would show Christianity to be not only not opposed to the present day hypothesis of evolution, but demanded by it. Both would find in the new psychology illustration and confirmation of their positions. Both, while saying much that is admirable, particularly within the sphere of theism, weaken what they say by a tendency to discern and to work analogies which, to us at least, do not exist. Both, moreover, fail signally in two respects: first, they are obliged "so to modify evolution that it becomes quite another thing from the hypothesis that passes by that name and with which the modern world is so familiar;" and, second, the Gospel which both would vindicate on the ground that it is a necessary corollary of evolution is "another gospel" from that of the Bible, as appears in their doctrine of "the natural genesis of conscience," in their consequently low view of sin, in their conception of the incarnation as necessary instead of voluntary, and as intended to reveal God rather than to save sinners, and in their equal misconception of the atonement as a mere by-product of the incarnation, which has its chief value in the revelation that it makes of the love of God.

This being so, the review of the former book being, as far as it goes, a review of the latter, it will be necessary to take up for particular consideration only one or two positions which in the latter are specially stressed.

1. God's ordinary relation to the universe. This is set forth as "directed to the whole universe impartially." That is, it is in no sense special. Scripture, however, knows of no such distinction between the natural and the Supernatural. Both are special, and both are equally special. The winds are God's ministers. The waves of the sea obey his behests. 'Not a sparrow falls to the ground without his notice.'

"The hairs of our head are all numbered. "He doeth according to his will in the army of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth." His providence is a universal fact, and every providence is special. It is not true, that evolution represents "the manufacturing process"; that God was competent to make its machinery entirely adequate to perfect the manufacturing; and that he does not need nor intend to interfere or do any part of it by hand' (p. 100). On the contrary, Scripture tolerates no such drastic conception. Whatever God could have done or might have done, he is continually recreating souls that were "dead in trespasses and sins": regeneration is not the result of evolution; it is the answer to the demand arising out of the inadequacy of evolution: not only is God's own hand on the evolutionary process at every point; but for "the purpose of making the world better, as well as for the purpose of advancing the work that natural law and evolution are engaged on, he has planned to interfere. In short, our author's whole conception of God's relation to natural laws is wrong and dangerous. It is not general; it is special.

2. Dr. Murray is in error, too, when he seeks a further distinction of the Supernatural in its personal character. Every act of God is personal. It makes no difference whether he works through the forces of nature or not. The personality of the carpenter comes into play as truly when he is using a lathe as when he is handling the wood himself. And our author's failure to recognize this has led him into very serious because very practical mistakes. Thus, for example, he finds the whole purpose of the miracle to be the gratification of personal feeling on God's part. But if this be so, how is it that miracles are not being wrought to-day? We have an adequate explanation, if we hold that the purpose is to attest a special supernatural revelation; for no such revelation is now being given: we have no explanation at all, if we adopt the explanation under criticism; for God, being "the same yesterday and to-day and forever", is as personal now as ever.

Again, the power of prayer, according to Dr. Murray, lies wholly in the fact that our prayers afford the occasion for personal action on God's part. They give him the opportunity of doing what will please us and thus of gratifying his personal feelings (p. 127). In a word, our prayers prevail because God wants to be kind and neighborly. "The point is that all the value your prayer has in the case is the amount of personal favor the result would be to you, for whatever God does in the matter in answer he is going to do solely as a favor to you," (p. 127). Has, then, God no other motive? Why is it that we are directed to urge other motives? Why are we taught that the supreme motive for our prayers as well as for God's answers to them is his own glory? But enough. *Ex his disce omnia.*

Princeton.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

The Survival of Jesus: A Priest's Study in Divine Telepathy.
J. HUNTLEY SKIRM, D.D. 12 mo. net \$2. George Doran Co., New York.

The author is a clergyman of the Church of England.

He writes in the character of 'John Desmond', who in a quest after a new theology converses with different friends and sets down his meditations in monologue.

His underlying philosophy may be summed up in three propositions: that most things that we know worth knowing we know by 'intuition'; that life is interchange of selves; and that persons thus interchange themselves telepathically.

This last is his discovery, the first principle of a new science. Precisely what he means by telepathy is not clear; but it is that which is common in interchange of thought and will between two persons still in the flesh, whether with or without a discernible medium between two persons one in the flesh and one 'dead' or 'discarnate', and between two discarnate persons. The basic 'fact' of his new science is exchange of thought and will between those still 'incarnate' and those 'discarnate', as also between two still incarnate without any known means of communication; for such telepathic communication he accepts as fact.

More controlling, however, in his thinking, though he does not seem to be aware of it, is his definition of life: it is organism and environment creating each other; it is interchange of thought and will between two persons; it is mutual sacrifice. One cannot live; two must live by each other, if either lives,—Father and Son, God and Man, Jesus and Disciple.

Applying this principle (for his three principles are one, life and telepathy being names for the same thing, and intuition being one part of this telepathic life), our author makes out, that God lives in Jesus the Man and Jesus the Man in God, which is the divinity of Christ; that Jesus as man lived in his disciples and they in him in the days of his flesh, by telepathic exchange of thought and will, of faith, lived thus in and from them in the three days he was in Hades, and in the forty days after his resurrection, while he had a 'body' in some sense, and lives thus in the days since, while now he has not a 'body' in the same sense; that the 'atonement' of Jesus the Man into God and of God into Jesus was consummated in his death, his full surrender to God; that atonement as between Jesus and man is begun and consummated in this mutual sacrifice, this interchange of faith between him and them; and that in the same telepathic way the many become the one Church.

What Dr. Skirm accomplishes is to produce a vague combination of words in which some like himself who are in Christ may construe their experience, and by which others may mistake their religious feelings for life in Christ. It can do no great harm; for it must utterly fail to found a new science or a new theology.

For it has two inherent weaknesses. First it builds on telepathy, something unproven and, if proven, too vague to base a science on. Second, it cuts out propitiation by the death of Christ, and yet en-

deavors to retain Christ as Savior. The Bible stands in the way. To eliminate propitiation from the Bible is impossible; to acknowledge that propitiation is taught in the Bible, and yet reject this teaching, is to discredit the Book too much to save its Hero for faith. Jesus Christ is a propitiation or a puzzle.

And why will men still hope to discover by defining simple ideas? To define life as 'interchange' of life gets nowhere; to define life as 'interchange' of what is not life gets nowhere. Is not 'interchange' more complete than 'life'? Or if life is defined as self-interchange, what is 'self'? This method is not intuition or observation or inference; it is confusion, delusive confusion.

F. P. RAMSAY.

EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY

The Social Teachings of The Prophets and Jesus. By CHARLES FOSTER KENT, PH.D., LITT.D., Woolsey Professor of Biblical Literature in Yale University. 8 vo; pp. XIII, 364. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons. 1917.

As Biblical Theology sets forth the theological doctrines of the Bible in the order and form of their historical development, so Prof. Kent would exhibit in like manner its sociological teachings. Indeed, he has given us a complete and admirable treatise on Biblical Sociology under the following heads: "The Social Ideals of the Pre-Exilic Prophets," "the Social Ideals of the Exilic and Post-Exilic Prophets and Sages," "The Social Ideals of Jesus," and "The Social Ideals of Jesus' Followers"—under these heads he has covered the whole subject. He has done this adequately, discriminatingly, in a way to make and hold the whole church, not to say the whole world, indebted to him.

The value of his work is much enhanced by his reference, in the case of every sociological teaching presented, to the Bible itself and to his citation in full in every instance of the passage referred to. Some may object that this favors those who are too indolent to look up references for themselves. This is true, but it is scarcely to the point. The author's aim is not primarily disciplinary. It is to present and to get understood the sociology of the Bible, and nothing could so conduce to this as the actual setting forth of the appropriate texts.

Not the least important part of the book is the "Appendix". This consists of three sections. The first gives a "Selected Bibliography". This is extensive and informing. It is not, however, nor does it claim to be, complete. Yet it must be added in passing that there are omissions, as Prof. Clow's "Christ in the Social Order," which we could neither justify nor explain even in a bibliography much more restricted. Section II contains a great number of admirably selected and stated "Subjects for Discussion and Investigation". These reveal

the teacher and a teacher of a very high order. Their aim is to evoke and to stimulate thought, and so successful are they in this that no thoughtful teacher or student can afford to be without them. Section III is a "Classified Index." This presents systematically the various topics which the discussion treats historically, and it enables one to turn instantly to the different Biblical statements of any social question.

And here we wish that we might arrest this review. Truth, however, compels two or three adverse criticisms;

1. The theology underlying and coloring the sociology set forth is "new" rather than true. This is so especially with regard to the authority of the Bible, the person of Christ and the Kingdom of God. The first is not held to be throughout "the infallible Word of the Lord." Its subject-matter rather than its source determines its authority. Hence, the modern sociologist may and should sit in judgment on it. If it is *the* text-book of sociology at all, it is only in so far as modern sociology approves it. Thus, too, the true deity of our Lord is impugned. He was mistaken as to the progress of his cause. He expected that it would be far more rapid and complete than it was (p. 279). And then "the Kingdom of God" is utterly misconceived. Its particular form depends mainly on its environment. Membership in it demands a new attitude. To taking this, while most require grace, some are equal of themselves. In a word, the distinctly evangelical conception of "the kingdom" as presupposing and in every case grounded on a supernatural regeneration is ignored, if it is ever admitted. It should not surprise us, therefore, to find that Prof. Kent constantly, as with regard to capital punishment and with respect to the finality of divorce, subordinates justice to mercy instead of founding the latter on the former. In a word, his theology is such as to necessitate a sociology which is unethical.

2. His economical position is, in like manner, false and pernicious. President Cleveland once remarked that 'economic laws are as inflexible as physical laws'. Hence, we must adapt ourselves to them, and it is only foolish because futile to try to modify them. Charity cannot arrest gravitation. Neither can it permanently lower prices in the interest of the poor. The law of supply and demand will assert itself in the end as surely as one body will attract another directly as the mass and inversely as the square of the distance. This, we take it, Prof. Kent would deny. Hence, some of his interpretations and applications of Scripture with regard to the acquisition and use of wealth are misleading. They hurt his book which in many respects is so admirable. Such teaching too often causes business men to regard Christianity as impracticable. Spiritual values are incomparably higher than pecuniary ones, but spiritual values evaporate when pecuniary ones are denied. To claim that charity should influence the purchasing power of a dollar is only to bring Christianity into disrepute and leave the value of the dollar unchanged.

3. The fundamental error of this whole work, however, is its virtual subordination of what our Lord calls "the first and the great commandment" to what he terms "the second" and in so far forth inferior one. That is, Prof. Kent would seem to regard the Bible as a sociological rather than a theological treatise. This utter misconception shows itself along two lines. One of these appears in his tendency to read a sociological meaning into that the import of which is clearly theological. An instance of this we have in his use of Matt. XX:1-15, the parable of the Householder and the Laborers in his Vineyard. This story our author cites as the foundation of his teaching with regard to "a living wage". So far, however, from throwing any light on the question whether every laborer, no matter how inefficient, is entitled to demand and receive a living, its great lesson is the divine sovereignty. At least, this is the lesson which our Lord himself draws from it. "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own? Is thine eye evil, because I am good? So the last shall be first, and the first last: for many be called, but few chosen." If any sociological teaching at all is intended, it is rather that laborers should recognize the providence of God in their wages and should be "content".

The other line along which the error in the tendency which we are criticizing is seen is the illogical positions in which this error issues. Thus, to keep to the case in hand, the requirement that every one should be paid a living wage is impossible. Such a wage would be the same for no two persons. What is luxury for one is poverty for another. And this applies even to the necessities of life. The Irishman starves on what the Chinaman would fatten. In a word, what the living wage is cannot be determined.

And if it could, that would not help the situation. The fact is that many are not worth a living wage in the labor market. This is no reason why they should not be supported. It is *the* reason why every Christian that can should help them and should do it in a spirit of love. "We that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak" (Rom. xv:1). The question is, however, in what way ought this to be done. It must be done in some way, but how? The champions of the living wage contend that it is best to delude this weak brother into supposing that he is *earning* what he needs. That is, the position under criticism rests on untruth. Therefore, though it were practical, it must be morally impossible; and that which involves deceit cannot be the meaning of any of Christ's teaching.

Princeton.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

A Century of Maryville College, 1819-1919. A Story of Altruism. By SAMUEL TYNDALE WILSON, D.D., Fifth President of the College. 1916, Pp. XVI. 265. Published by the Directors of Maryville College, Maryville, Tennessee.

This is a book of rare interest, the record of toil and sacrifice for the glory of God and the good of men that have yielded a rich

harvest. The story is divided into two parts, treating of the period before and the period after the Civil War.

The College had its origin, like so many institutions of learning, in the desire to provide educated religious leaders. The need pressed heavily upon the heart of Isaac Anderson, and he set himself to the task of providing "a learned and pious ministry to bless and adorn our rising country". The regions beyond appealed to him mightily. "One summer he rode horseback over most of the mountainous countries of Central East Tennessee . . . and everywhere he preached to the people, and pitied their frontier destitution . . . he marked out a circuit of about one hundred and fifty miles which he covered during one week every month, leaving home on Monday morning and returning home on the following Saturday" (p. 25). At this time he was preaching twice on Sunday, conducting an academy, and caring for a farm. Yet he wrote, "I have for some years past viewed my situation with silent dissatisfaction. My sphere of action, both as a minister of the gospel and a teacher, has been too limited. I have often felt the conviction that I am not serving my day and generation in any suitable manner". (p. 26).

In 1811 he removed his academy to Maryville. In 1819 he tried to find ministers in New York and Philadelphia who would help him in his work, but in vain. "Then he turned his horse's head toward Princeton, where the first Presbyterian Theological Seminary had been organized seven years before. Here at his hotel he held an interview with a number of the students and begged them to go to East Tennessee to help in the Lord's harvest fields. He depicted to them the destitution and challenged their assistance. But Tennessee was at the end of the earth in those days, and the fields nearer home had a prior claim upon them and insisted upon that claim" (p. 38). Thus thrown upon his own resources, he determined that a Theological Seminary must be established in the region where the need was greatest. "The Seminaries of Andover and Princeton" he said, "while they display the public spirit, the ardor and strength of piety in a portion of our country, will not be able for centuries to come, to supply with ministers the vast uncultivated regions of the South and West" (p. 39). In 1819 the Southern and Western Theological Seminary was established by the Synod of Tennessee. It is interesting to compare the curriculum with that which is in use in the Seminaries of today. "The Greek Testament and the Hebrew Bible, Jewish Antiquities, Sacred Chronology, Biblical Criticism, Metaphysics, Didactic and Polemic Theology, Church History, Church Government, Composition and Delivery of Sermons and the Duties of the Pastoral Care" (p. 43).

Dr. Anderson might say, The Seminary, it is I. The story of his labors is almost beyond belief. Sometimes he taught twelve hours a day, doing three men's work. He usually preached about two hundred sermons a year, for he was the pastor of two Churches. For his

services as professor he received no salary until 1830, and year by year spent hundreds of dollars from his own resources to assist needy students. The new Seminary soon began to draw students from a distance. Two or three young men came from New Hampshire, making the journey of six weeks on foot. Others walked from Baltimore. Professors were added to the faculty, receiving salaries which ranged from \$600 a year to nothing. The history of the Seminary to the Civil War is termed a Continuous Crisis (p. 103). Other departments of instruction were added from time to time, and the theological school was virtually extinct when the war gave the final blow. But a great work had been accomplished in the education of a hundred and fifty ministers.

The College was closed from April, 1861, to the fall of 1866, when it opened with thirteen students. The outlook was dark. But God raised up friends, and men and women gave themselves to the work with heroic devotion. Dr. Bartlett, the third president, taught the Senior Class in every department of study. Dr. Samuel T. Wilson was chosen president in 1901, and performs the duties of his office with fidelity and ability worthy of those who have gone before.

Many will read with special interest the words so graciously and tenderly spoken in memory of Miss Margaret E. Henry. Some of us have known her as a charming speaker and delightful guest, who worshipped and served her Lord in the beauty of holiness. The endeavor to raise \$100,000 to provide a permanent memorial of her work for the College and the Church should be crowned with speedy success.

The teachers and officers of the College now number fifty, and the student body has grown to eight hundred. In 1916 there were forty candidates for the ministry. There is a campus of two hundred and fifty acres with handsome and commodious buildings. In addition to the academic courses of study, there is vocational training in Home Economics and Agriculture, and provision will be made as soon as the way is open for various forms of skilled manual labor. The charge for tuition is \$18 a year, for board \$7.60 a month.

Maryville is emphatically a Christian College, and the Bible has a place in the required course of study.

A number of illustrations lend additional interest to this inspiring tale of service which has enjoyed such manifest and manifold tokens of the favor of God.

Princeton.

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY

Is the Coming of Christ Before or After the Millenium? By J. M. HALDEMAN, D.D. Pastor of the First Baptist Church, New York, N. Y. Chas. C. Cook, New York, 1917. Pp. 75.

We have in this pamphlet a sermon on the second coming of our

Lord, preached in October, 1916, by Dr. Haldeman. It confines itself almost exclusively to the question whether the return of Christ will be before or after the Millenium. It ignores the view of those who believe that there will be no Millenium and that Christ will come to end this age and introduce the consummation of the Kingdom of God in eternity.

The pamphlet, then, is a defense of the pre-millennial view and a vigorous diatribe against post-millennialism. The post-millennialist, Dr. Haldeman asserts, exhibits a total ignorance of what the Bible teaches concerning the Second Advent, an ignorance which he describes as being "as deeply midnight as the palpable darkness of Egypt." He complains that they constitute the majority of professing Christians, furnish the Presidents and Faculties of theological institutions, and pride themselves on being orthodox in spite of their ignorance of the Word of God.

In the face of this ignorance and this claim of orthodoxy, Dr. Haldeman affirms that he will "demonstrate and prove the post-millennial theory of the world's conversion before the Coming of the Lord to be extra-Biblical, wholly unscriptural, without a single foundation in the Word of God, confusing in exposition, utterly absurd as exegesis and contradicted by the facts of history, observation and experience."

The view which Dr. Haldeman professes to defend is the pre-millennial one. We give it briefly in his own language. He proposes to show that the Bible teaches that "as the age goes on the Gospel will be less and less successful, the Church instead of overcoming the world will be overcome by the world, sin, iniquity, lawlessness and war will increase. At an undetermined moment the Lord will suddenly come into the upper air, raise the dead in Christ, transfigure the living and genuine Christians and take them to Himself in Heaven; the world, for a season will be given over to Satanic power; iniquity will head itself up in monstrous and blasphemous forms; then the Lord with His previously caught-up saints will descend in majesty and might, execute judgment against all unrighteousness, cleanse the earth, and having bound Satan and rendered him helpless for a thousand years, bring in the Kingdom of life and peace."

It will naturally be impossible within the limits of a brief notice of this pamphlet to discuss and expound adequately all the passages of Scripture to which Dr. Haldeman appeals in proof of his view, much less to unfold the meaning of many essential passages which he omits to take any notice of, or, in some cases, even to mention. All that we shall attempt is to give some samples of Dr. Haldeman's exegesis in the case of some crucial passages upon which he chiefly relies, to seek to give briefly their true meaning which we believe he misses, and to point to some portions of the Bible of which he has failed to take any account.

Dr. Haldeman relies chiefly on some of the Parables of our Lord recorded in the thirteenth Chapter of Matthew's Gospel.

The first of these is the parable of the Sower. The seed, as Jesus tells us (v. 19), is the Word of the Kingdom, and the parable is designed to teach the general truth, applicable always, that the result of sowing this seed depends on the nature of the ground in which it is sown. Our Lord does not teach us here concerning the way in which the ground must be prepared so as to bring forth fruit. After remarking on the kind of hindrances to the Gospel taught by the parable, Dr. Haldeman goes on to say that two things are to be learned from its application. The first is that "during the absence of our Lord the Gospel would have, not a universal, but *fractional* reception." Secondly, that "during the absence of our Lord there would be a trinity of persistent, unchanging opposition to the Gospel, the world, the flesh, and the Devil."

Now it does not require any great amount of exegetical skill to see at once that these ideas are simply read into the parable by Dr. Haldeman. If one will read carefully the parable and its explanation by Jesus, he will notice at once that there is not a word said by our Lord, either in the parable or in the explanation of it, from which it can possibly be inferred that we have here a prediction of a state of things which is to endure until Christ's return. To interpret it as a prediction is to misunderstand totally its simple meaning as given by Jesus Himself. It is a simple, yet profound statement of the great truth that the effect of the Word of God is conditioned by the spiritual condition of men's hearts. Dr. Haldeman's interpretation, we must conclude, is absolutely without foundation in the words of Jesus as recorded by the evangelist.

Dr. Haldeman next takes up the parable of the Tares. The Kingdom of Heaven is like a man who has sowed good seed in his field. While men slept, *i.e.*, at the time when men are wont to rest, *his* enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat and went away. When the wheat appeared, the tares appeared also. His servants asked if they should go and root them up (separate them or gather them together). The householder forbade them lest they root up the wheat also. He tells them to let them grow together till the harvest, when he will send forth his reapers to bind the tares in a bundle to be burned, but the wheat should be gathered into his barn. Dr. Haldeman concludes that two things are clearly taught, first that the wheat and the tares grow together till the harvest, and second that at the harvest the field is to be a mixed one of wheat and tares. From our Lord's explanation of the parable Dr. Haldeman concludes that when Jesus returns he will find a world divided between the children of God and the children of the Devil.

Here Dr. Haldeman's zeal for his own view has carried him too far. The main point of the parable is not to teach that the tares increase in the wheat field. Nothing is said about such an increase. In fact the main point is not to predict the nature of the Kingdom during the inter-adventual period or at the end of it. It is true, the words "let both grow together till the harvest," and Christ's explanation that the

harvest is the end of the age, give to the parable an eschatological setting. But it is a mistake to infer from this that the main purpose is to predict the character of the Kingdom at the end. Jesus emphasizes the fact that the one who sowed the tares is *his* enemy in particular. He describes him as being the Devil. He says that the one who sowed the good seed is the Son of Man *i.e.*, the Messiah to whom God has committed the Messianic judgment and final separation of the righteous and the wicked. Moreover, in forbidding his servants to separate the tares from the wheat, our Lord says emphatically that *he* will send *his* reapers to do this when the time comes. These points are stressed. Our Lord's main purpose clearly is to state that since he himself as Messiah is the Judge who is coming to execute this judgment, the separation of the righteous and the wicked should not be made before the appointed time, and should not be made by men. All else belongs to the details of the picture and should not be pressed beyond the obvious meaning of our Lord's teaching. There is no prediction, then, that the tares will increase. It is exceedingly doubtful even if any inference is justified that there will be any tares at the end, since it is not Christ's aim to predict the character of the Kingdom at the end, but to give a practical lesson to his followers. It might seem as if it could be inferred that there will be tares at the end, from the words, "let them grow together," and from Christ's statement that at the end he will separate them. But even this inference would seem to go too far in view of the fact that a prediction as to the future character of the Kingdom is not the purpose of the teaching of the parable, as before indicated. Moreover it should be borne in mind that the general Resurrection precedes the final Judgment, and that since the "Sons of the Kingdom" includes all the righteous, so the sons of evil must include all the wicked who have lived and died. Hence the separation is not a rooting out of evil men living at the end, but is a picture of the final Judgment and the separation of the righteous and the wicked. In a word, we cannot learn anything from this parable as to the character of the Kingdom at the end of this age, but must look elsewhere for instruction upon this point.

It is in the parable of the Leaven that we find such definite teaching concerning the expansion of the Kingdom at the end of this age and the return of Christ. Dr. Haldeman deals with this parable after the fashion with which we are now familiar. The Kingdom of Heaven, our Lord says, is like leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal until it was leavened, even the whole of it. The emphasis is on the fact that the whole of the meal was leavened. The order of the words in the sentence makes this most emphatic. The point obviously is the expansive power of the leaven and the certainty that it will leaven the whole mass into which it is introduced. It only remains to determine what is the leaven and what is the three measures of meal. Dr. Haldeman calls attention to the fact that the woman takes only three measures of meal and that three measures of anything is not the whole. "If I take," he says, "three measures of meal out of a barrel of

meal, I am not taking all the meal in the barrel." He concludes that since the Gospel is to be preached to the whole world, the three measures of meal cannot denote the world, but must signify the Church. It is the Church, he concludes, not the world, which is to be leavened.

It is difficult to take seriously such a bizarre method of interpretation. It would seem superfluous to say that this identification of the three measures of meal with the Church is impossible. It is impossible first because the Church is the present form of the Kingdom and the Kingdom, according to our Lord, is the leaven inserted into the meal and not the meal into which it is inserted. Secondly, this identification of the three measures of meal with the Church is most forced and unnatural because nothing at all is said about a woman taking three measures of meal out of a barrel of meal or any other larger quantity. Three measures is mentioned simply because that is about the amount which would naturally be taken at one time for baking. To infer from the fact that three measures are thus naturally mentioned, that it must have been taken from a larger mass, and that this larger mass, not mentioned at all in the parable, must nevertheless signify the world, is worse than pressing insignificant details, it is inventing details which are not in the parable, and then making these invented details denote realities. This is a work of the constructive imagination or fancy; it is not exegesis. Trench (*The Parables of our Lord*, p. 95) has stated the matter correctly when he says—"Why should *three* measures of meal be mentioned? It may perhaps be sufficiently answered, Because it was just so much as at one time would be commonly mixed." By the leaven our Lord means, as he says, the Kingdom, and by the meal, therefore, the world. It surely betrays a total incapacity for the interpretation of parables to demand that if our Lord wanted to represent the world by meal, he must have said that the woman took a barrelful or a store-houseful!

The three measures of meal, then, evidently denote the world. What does the leaven stand for? Dr. Haldeman says that leaven is a "sour, corrupt, putrid and putrifying thing." He says that this is its ordinary use in Scripture. Further, having identified the meal with the Church, he finds that if the leaven here did not signify evil, it would have to signify the Gospel which is absolutely good, and the Gospel, he says, cannot be hidden. This difficulty, however, as we have seen, is one of his own making. The meal into which the leaven was put is the world. Jesus says that the Kingdom of Heaven is like leaven. It seems that the leaven denotes the Kingdom. It is true, as Jülicher notes (*Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, II p. 579) that the introductory formulas of the parables are not exact, and it would not be absolutely impossible to take the Kingdom here as a passive factor to which something like the parable happens. But, as Jülicher very aptly remarks, to suppose, in direct connection with the triumphant parable of the Mustard Seed, that Jesus meant to teach that the Kingdom is to become entirely corrupt, is "monstrous" (*ungeheuerlich*). Indeed, as Zahn says (*Kommentar zum N.T. I Das Evangelium des Matthäus*³ p. 500, foot

note), this interpretation would either yield the incredible idea that the Kingdom in all its parts will become entirely corrupted, or else the words *ὁμοία ἐστίν* must express only the thought that it is our task to keep the Kingdom from all similarity with the occurrence which here serves as a parable. If the former idea is "monstrous," the latter is surely flat in the extreme, and cannot have been our Lord's meaning.

But there is no need to take the parable in other than its obvious sense. Nothing could be plainer. Even where leaven is used in Scripture as denoting evil, it is its expansive, penetrating, and not its corrupting power, which is specially signified. And here the point to be illustrated is not a process which is to be characterized either as corrupting or as beneficial. The point is the penetrating and expansive power of the Kingdom. The Devil is called a roaring lion in the Scripture, and so also is Jesus called the lion of the tribe of Judah. When our Lord wished to illustrate the growing power of the Kingdom, it was natural that he should choose the figure of leaven. Jesus here encourages his disciples. The Kingdom is now small and hidden. In the first parable he had taught that the Word of the Kingdom was truly planted when sown in the heart of a believing hearer. But they were in a world which still went on in its old way. John the Baptist had announced the coming of the Kingdom and its power. How shall this be, or will it really be? Yes, our Lord says, for the Kingdom is like leaven; it will penetrate the whole world until it is entirely transformed. The absoluteness and the certainty of this result are the great ideas which are here expressed.

We should note that Dr. Haldeman cannot escape the obvious emphasis which our Lord's words here put on the absoluteness of the result. For having identified the meal with the Church and the leaven with evil, he cannot escape the consequence, and hence asserts that the parable teaches that the Church is to be wholly and absolutely corrupted through and through. How then can he harmonize this with his own interpretation of the parable of the Tares? For there, according to him, Jesus taught that at the end of this age the tares and the wheat were to be growing side by side; here, on the contrary, there would be no wheat left! To such hopeless difficulties are we driven when we set out to interpret the Scripture after a pre-conceived theory.

We might well pass on now from the teaching of Jesus, but we must give one more example of Dr. Haldeman's exegetical methods where he makes an assertion which is contrary to fact. In the parable of the Importunate Widow in Luke XVIII, after the saying that God will hear His people and come to deliver them, Dr. Haldeman adds that in giving this assurance Jesus asks the "far-meaning" question, "When the Son of Man cometh shall he find faith on the earth?" And then Dr. Haldeman adds that the manner of the question and the use of the "negative particle" in the Greek demand that the answer shall be in the negative. This is not in accordance with the facts. The particle used is not a "negative" particle. It is the interrogative particle *ἤρα*. This is an interrogative particle with illative force, from the

same root as the illative particle *ἀπα*. If one will take the trouble to consult any Lexicon of New Testament Greek, such for example as that of Thayer, he will find that this particle may be used in questions where either an affirmative or negative answer is expected, or where no answer but rather doubt is expressed. It is used here without any expectation of an answer to the question which it introduces. The definite article before the word "faith" should also be noticed. It is *the* faith exhibited in persistent prayer, to which Jesus refers. He spake the parable, as we learn from verse 1, to teach that men ought always to pray and not to faint. Over against the unjust Judge, he sets the righteous God. Over against the delay of the unjust Judge to render aid to the woman, he sets the speed with which the righteous God comes to the succour of his people. In this question Jesus is not seeking information, or expecting to learn the future from his hearers. Nor is he trying to teach his disciples concerning the future. His purpose is to encourage trust and prayer, to exhort to effort and to the attitude illustrated by the importunate widow. God, he says, ever listens. He is not like the unjust Judge. And the allusion to the faithfulness of God to His people, which endures through all ages, leads Jesus' thought to the end when he will come again. Always, even till then, is God ready to succour. Will his people fail, or will they be like the widow and persist in prayer and in the faith which such prayer manifests? There is no failure in God. Let God's people see to it that they ever trust Him and call upon Him for help. Why should Jesus, as Dr. Warfield pointedly remarks (*Expository Times*, XXV, p. 137), in the very act of commending persistent prayer to his disciples and of promising God's speedy help to them, suddenly turn to declare that after a while God will have no people left to succour? Dr. Haldeman seems to have missed altogether the point of the parable and of our Lord's question.

When we turn to the teaching of Paul we find that out of the 75 pages of his pamphlet Dr. Haldeman devotes only one page to the teaching of Paul. The letters of Paul are rich in eschatological teaching, and quite explicit upon the points which we have been considering, and yet all this wealth of eschatological material is passed over with but a few remarks. Paul writes to Timothy, Dr. Haldeman remarks, and warns him that the Spirit says expressly that in the last times there should be a departure from the faith, a giving heed to wandering spirits and to doctrines proclaimed by demon inspired teachers. Dr. Haldeman makes no further comment on this passage, but simply passes on, evidently assuming that the phrase "the last times" refers to the end of this age. This phrase, however, in the New Testament is constantly used to denote this age beginning with the birth of Jesus. We have been living in "the last times," according to the New Testament, ever since Jesus was born. The Apostle John, for example (I Jn. II 18), writes "Little Children, it is the last hour, and as ye have heard that anti-Christ cometh, even now there are many anti-Christ; whereby we know that it is the last hour." Nothing could be more

explicit than this. John says that when he wrote the last hour had come, that even then there were many anti-Christ's, and that from this it could be known that it was the last hour. Similarly Peter (I Pet. 1 20), speaking of the precious blood of Christ, says that He was fore-ordained before the foundation of the world, but was made manifest at the last times for his readers, referring to the appearance of our Lord on earth at His birth. Peter also on the day of Pentecost (Acts II 17) says that the last days prophesied by Joel had already come upon them in the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews says (Hebs. I 2) that God who in times past spake unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in the last days spoken unto his readers by a Son, referring to the revelation of God in the coming of Christ to the world. "The last times," then, had already come, according to the New Testament writers, when they were writing. Just so in this passage in I Tim. IV Paul is writing to warn Timothy against false teachings which were then prevalent, as is perfectly clear from verse 3. Dr. Haldeman's tacit assumption that "the last times" refers to the end of this age and the time of the parousia or return of Christ, is quite without any foundation.

Precisely similar is Paul's meaning in 2 Timothy III where he again warns Timothy against all kinds of evil men, and then exhorts him to abide in the things which he had learned. Paul is evidently exhorting Timothy to steadfastness in the faith, amidst evils already in existence when he wrote. There is no proof, and Dr. Haldeman offers none, that this passage refers to the end of this age and the parousia.

The only other Pauline passage to which Dr. Haldeman refers is the one at the opening of the second chapter of 2 Thessalonians. But he passes over this difficult passage with only a few words, and gives no consideration to the view of those who have urged many grounds for supposing that the events of which Paul speaks are already long past.

This is all that Dr. Haldeman has to say in support of his view from the teaching of Paul. He passes over without even mention the eleventh chapter of Romans where Paul draws for us that great picture of a saved world, and the fifteenth chapter of first Corinthians where this is definitely put before the second coming of our Lord. When Jesus comes again it will be to give up his Messianic reign which began with his resurrection and is to continue until he has put all his enemies under his feet. This age is the time of the advancing conquest. The end, Paul says, is when Christ shall have delivered up the Kingdom to God and shall have put down all rule, and all authority, and power (verse 24). His Mediatorial reign must continue till he has put *all* enemies under his feet (verse 25). The *last* enemy which shall be destroyed is death (verse 26). This destruction of death takes place in the resurrection of Christ's people which occurs when he returns (verse 23). Hence when Jesus returns to raise the dead, *all* his enemies, save death only, will have been conquered. He is to return, therefore, to a converted world, to complete his conquest by the destruction of his only remaining enemy which is death.

Paul knows only of two ages and world-orders, the temporal and the eternal, and the coming again of Christ is the point which separates them. His view of their relation is historical and eschatological. The new world of spiritual reality lies in the future, but has already begun in the transformation of this age at the resurrection of Christ. The risen Christ is the center of this heavenly world which is being realized historically in this present age. This realization is by the Spirit with which Christ was endowed at his resurrection, and the glorious triumph is assured, so that when Jesus comes again it will be to usher in the final consummation of the Kingdom of God in eternity. It is needless to say that this is a very different picture from that given by Dr. Haldeman.

We must pass over his very brief treatment of James and Peter. His whole discussion rests on the presupposition that all the evils referred to are put at the end, for which idea he neither gives nor can give any proof.

In the closing pages of his pamphlet Dr. Haldeman makes much of the present evil condition of the world, and of the war which has drenched the world with blood and saddened us all. That there are many causes of discouragement about us, no one can deny. There is worldliness, false doctrine, and lukewarmness in the Church. There is evil in the world, and who is there whose heart is not appalled by the suffering caused by the terrible war? But we must remember that Jesus has told us that wars and rumours of wars are not signs of the approach of his coming, but rather show us that the end is not yet. We must remember that with God a thousand years are as one day. Though discouraged by the present state of the world and of God's Kingdom in the world, if we trust in His promises we may cherish the sure hope that the Kingdoms of this world will become the Kingdom of God and Christ, and that having conquered the world to himself, Jesus will come again to usher in the blessedness of eternity.

C. W. HODGE.

Princeton.

When Christ Comes Again. By GEORGE P. ECKMAN. The Abingdon Press; New York, Cincinnati, 1917. Pp. 287.

This volume deals in a broad way with the Second Coming of Christ. It does not confine itself to matters in dispute between pre-millennialists and post-millennialists.

After discussing our Lord's great eschatological discourse, the author deals with the manner of Christ's second coming, showing that it will be personal, visible, and glorious. The purpose of our Lord's return will be to raise the dead, execute the final Judgment and to give to men final rewards and punishments.

The time of our Lord's return occupies a separate chapter, and the conclusion is that it is unknown. The author next asks what Christ is doing now, and shows that he is reigning in heaven and with men on earth. He is interceding for his people, and preparing homes for them in heaven.

The author next raises the question whether the world is growing better. His answer to this is in the affirmative, though he does not believe that Jesus will return to a completely converted world. His view may be called a-millennial *i.e.*, he thinks that there is no millenium predicted in the Bible, and that the only millenium is in eternity in the Kingdom of God in its final consummation. Jesus will come to raise all the dead, execute judgment, and usher in the eternal heavenly Kingdom.

The last part of the volume is devoted to a fair, sober, and Scriptural criticism of what the author calls "the pre-millennial program," showing very pointedly the difficulties involved in the ideas of "the Rapture," "the Revelation," "the Great Tribulation," the several returns of our Lord, the several judgments, and the two-fold resurrection. Mr. Eckman does this very well. He proves beyond doubt for any unprejudiced reader that these ideas are not only unscriptural but also in direct conflict with the Bible. The book is a very good popular presentation of what may be called the a-millennial view of the second advent of Christ.

C. W. HODGE.

Princeton.

The Way of Salvation in the Lutheran Church. By G. H. GERBERDING, D.D., LL.D., Professor in Chicago Seminary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church; Maywood, Ill. Preface by M. Rhodes, D.D., Reformation Jubilee Edition. General Council Publication House, Philadelphia, Pa., 1917. Pp. 280.

This is a new edition of a book which has gone through several editions, and which has been published in translations into several languages. The new edition has been enlarged by the addition of an Introduction by the author, and a new chapter on Revivals. The volume aims to set forth in a practical way for the lay reader the way of salvation as taught by the Lutheran Church.

Dr. Gerberding begins with a chapter on Original Sin, showing that all men are sinners and totally unable to save themselves. He sets forth briefly the Protestant doctrine on this subject. He then proceeds to show the necessity for the new birth. This, he says, ordinarily takes place through baptism. The child is born again in baptism, and, as it grows up, should be kept in the way of salvation by instruction in the Word of God, by confirmation at the proper time and admission to the Lord's Supper. Three chapters are devoted to the Lord's Supper, setting forth the Lutheran view.

In case the child falls away,—for the new birth is only the implanting of a seed of life which may be lost,—conversion through the Word is necessary. Conversion is necessary also for all adults who have not been regenerated in infancy. The Holy Spirit works through the Word in a supernatural way, converting the sinner unless he fatally resists. These chapters are devoted to the discussion of conversion.

This is followed by a chapter on Justification and one on Sanctification, and the volume closes with five chapters on Revivals.

What Dr. Gerberding gives, in a word, is just the doctrine of Prevenient Grace in its Lutheran form as attached to the sacraments. The issue of the process of salvation is determined by man through resistance or non-resistance of this grace. The sinner cannot cooperate in his salvation, but notwithstanding this, "on himself is all the responsibility if he perish," for he can resist the grace of God. Dr. Gerberding says that "sailing thus under the colors of Scripture doctrine, we steer clear of the Scylla of Calvinism on the one hand, and also escape the Charybdis of Arminianism on the other." "We give," he continues, "to Sovereign Grace all the glory of our salvation just as much as the Calvinists do. And yet we make salvation as free as the boldest Arminian does."

This has always been the Lutheran's boast. Dr. Gerberding has stated their position as given by the Formula of Concord. He teaches the entire inability of fallen man, denies any preparation for or co-operation with Divine Grace, but at the same time asserts that the Grace of God may be fatally resisted. The reason why a man is saved, then, is because he receives grace from God; the reason why anyone is lost is because he resists this very same grace.

This of course is impossible. If all men are totally unable to save themselves or to cooperate with grace; if all who hear the Word receive the same kind and degree of grace; if those who perish are lost because they resist this grace then it must follow that if any are saved, it is because they do not resist, and it is impossible to ascribe "all the glory of our salvation to the Sovereign Grace of God." It obviously rests with man. On the other hand, if all the saved are saved *solely* by the saving and omnipotent Grace of God, then it must follow that those who are lost perish because they do not receive this grace, and it becomes impossible to maintain that the saved and the lost receive the same grace, and that the lost perish because they resist this grace.

In a word, it is impossible to maintain that salvation is due solely to God, and being lost due solely to man. If all who are saved are saved by God's grace, the being lost cannot depend ultimately on man's will. This is only to say that there is no middle ground between Calvinism and Arminianism. Lutheranism in the Formula of Concord occupied an absolutely untenable position, and later Lutheranism recognized this in making election depend on the foresight by God of faith.

But the rise of faith, according to Lutheranism, is determined by non-resistance to Divine Grace in the case of the conversion of an adult, and non-resistance to this grace is also what "keeps the baptismal covenant" in the case of a child who does not fall away when it grows up. Consequently resistance and non-resistance are really the determining factors of salvation in Lutheranism, and in all its forms, if consistent, it must make salvation depend ultimately on man. The Bible, however, makes it depend on God. Hence we cannot allow Dr. Gerberding's claim that the Lutheran way of salvation is the Scriptural way.

It is difficult, moreover, to see how, according to Lutheran principles,

an infant dying in infancy can be saved. The Lutheran might say that it is too young to resist Divine grace. But on the other hand it may be replied that if this saving grace in baptism is in the Word of God pronounced in the sacrament, as Dr. Gerberding affirms, then it is very hard to understand how the Word of God can have any saving effect except through its reception by an intelligent faith which the infant cannot exercise. If, on the other hand, the infant is regenerated by the immediate power of God, then it is difficult to understand what the Word of God in the baptismal formula has to do with the matter.

Furthermore, if regeneration is nothing more than the implanting in the infant so weak a seed of new life that its final result, if the infant grows up, is dependent on resistance and non-resistance to the Word, then it would seem doubtful if, on so weakened a conception of regeneration, the infant dying in infancy is really saved. At least it would leave us in painful doubt on the subject.

If Lutheranism is to escape from untenable inconsistencies, it must return to the Augustinianism of Luther, or proceed on a downward course through Arminianism to out and out Pelagianism, for Arminianism is not free from its own difficulties and inconsistencies.

As we approach the celebration of the Reformation, it is well to remember that Luther was an Augustinian, and that the Reformation was chiefly a revival of Augustinianism, a magnifying of the Grace of God bringing salvation.

C. W. HODGE.

Princeton.

PRACTICAL THEOLOGY

The Mind of God. By ELWIN L. HOUSE, D.D., Fleming H. Revell Co., 1917. Pp. 188. \$1 net.

The Preface puts us on our guard by affirming "Startling, indeed, are some of the new truths brought forth in this volume!" But the reader finds that what is new is rather curious than startling. The purpose of the book is to use the principles of modern psychology to throw light upon the nature of the Trinity; and there are three sections of the book:

- I. Jesus, the Conscious Mind of God.
- II. The Father, the Subconscious Mind of God.
- III. The Holy Spirit the Superconscious Mind of God.

It cannot be said that this mode of approaching the subject has clarified or enlarged our understanding of this high mystery. The endeavor to carry out the thought in detail is sure to lead to error. We read "God never thought anything, said anything, did anything, except through Christ" (p. 17). Did not the Father love the Son, give the Son, exalt the Son? We read again, "God has no reason, no will, no judgment, no forgiveness except in Jesus Christ" (p. 53). But did

not Jesus testify that his power was all received from the Father, that he lived in constant communion with the Father? This is merely a suggestion of the difficulties that beset the path of the author.

There are various statements that call for criticism. We have no Scripture warrant for identifying Lucifer with Satan (p. 22). The distinction between devil and demon in Bible usage is apparently not understood (p. 26). Why does it "seem that God's original plan was that man should not die *or work*" (p. 35)? The Scripture tells us that "Jehovah God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it" (Gen. 2:15). In the familiar quotation from Wordsworth on p. 81 we find "interposed" for "interfused"; and the remainder of the quotation is not quite exact.

The most startling thing we have found in the book is the use of the text regarding the heavenly witnesses, I. John 5:7, to establish the doctrine of the Trinity (p. 131). It is said, "Paul *justified* Jesus with the Spirit (p. 131), where we should apparently read *identified*. On p. 139 we are told that the Dispensation of the Holy Spirit will prove a failure yet "nearer to man God cannot get than when he comes into vital touch with His Spirit, in the Spirit of His Son" (p. 140). Calvin was not a fatalist (p. 151).

Our knowledge of the Trinity is not appreciably enhanced by this new attempt to sound the depths of the divine nature.

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

Princeton.

The Grand Adventure and Other Sermons. By ROBERT LAW, D.D.,
Knox College, Toronto. George H. Doran Co., 1916. Pp. 219.
\$1.25 net.

These are strong sermons, rich in thought, clear and vigorous in expression. There is a rare note of distinction in the style. Great themes are treated in an adequate and inspiring way. The title of the volume is taken from the sermon on Heb. 11:8—"He went out, not knowing whither he went."

There are frequent allusions to the war, and the book is dedicated "to my soldier-sons, Robert, Ralph and Ronald, and their Comrades in the 19th and the 187th Battalions, C.E.F." Here too it is gratifying to observe that while it is earnestly maintained that the Allies are contending for justice and righteousness, yet "we must have the courage, and maintain it, not to return hate for hate,—the cause we fight for is an ideal which is sullied by every hateful or savage thought. It would not be worth fighting for if it were the cause of hate, if its object were revenge" (p. 38).

The crowning excellence of these admirable sermons is that they are thoroughly Scriptural. They adhere to the text, they draw their language and their illustrations largely from the Word. And Christ is everywhere exalted. "To look to Christ, to study Christ, to follow Christ, to put on Christ, to wash the robes of character in his blood, to live the sacrificial life after Him, that is our task" (p. 108). "We

must never take our eyes off the Cross. If we look away from the Cross we shall forget what sin is, what the love of Christ is, the sacrificial power of God to overcome sin" (p. 79). "To me the Cross of Calvary is the manifestation in our humanity, in His Son Jesus Christ, of the Cross of God, that Cross of suffering, sorrowing love with which the sins and follies of men have pierced and still pierce the heart of the Eternal" (p. 205).

It is delightful to find the Gospel preached with such intelligence, simplicity, and power.

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

Princeton.

When Faiths Flash Out, Essays in Spiritual Replenishment. By DAVID BAINES-GRIFFITHS, M.A., Minister Edgehill Church, New York. Fleming H. Revell Co., 1917, pp. 192. \$1 net.

This volume contains twenty-five essays of decided interest, thoughtful, well written, dealing with important themes in an intelligent and inspiring fashion. The illustrations are drawn from varied fields of literature and life, and are apt and striking. The spirit is earnest and devout, and there is everywhere apparent a just appreciation of moral and spiritual values.

The statement that "the hunter of heresy is one who has become sceptical of his professed Gospel" (p. 90) will not stand the test of history. From the days of Saul of Tarsus to the present hour persecution has been largely the work of fanatics who thought they were doing God service. That Seneca was a heathen saint" (p. 123) is by no means so obvious to others as it appears to be to the author of these essays. Bishop Lightfoot's estimate of him in the Dissertation on St. Paul and Seneca appended to his Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians is probably nearer the truth. "We may reject as calumnies the grosser charges with which the malignity of his enemies has laden his memory; but enough remains in the admission of his admirers, and more than enough in the testimony of his own writings, to forfeit his character as a high-minded and sincere man." Heathenism may present a number of men and women who have a higher right to the title of saint than Seneca.

It is certainly a most inadequate and unjust judgment of Augustine that with him and Ezekiel "the pressure of the preaching may have been upon" "the preservation of the outward altar" (p. 165).

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

Princeton.

The Book of Joy. By JOHN T. DAVIS, D.D., George H. Doran Co., 1917. pp. 284. \$1 net.

The Preface informs us that "the Book of Joy is a book of experience, not of theory; it tells how joy actually came into the lives of real men and women as they learned the secret of living from Him who came among men that His joy might be in them and that their joy

might be full, and how like joy may become the possession of all who will walk with Him in paths of unselfish service." The theme thus indicated is well worked out, and the truth is made plain by abundant illustrations drawn from every walk of life. The book brings a message of hope and cheer to those who are disheartened and depressed, and lays bare the secret of true and abiding joy. Much excellent material is furnished for use in the pulpit. It should not be said without qualification that "the world hates the name of Christ" (p. 64).

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

Princeton.

The First Fruits and Other Poems. By KATE TUCKER GOODE. Fleming H. Revell Co., 1914. Pp. 221.

The poem which gives the title to this volume deals with the various appearances of Jesus to the disciples after his resurrection. A number of miscellaneous verses follow, and the book closes with a dramatic poem, "A Princess of Virginia," telling the romantic story of Pocahontas. It may be said in general that the poems are graceful and pleasing, but disclose no extraordinary poetic gift.

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

Princeton.

Tennyson's Use of the Bible. By EDNA MOORE ROBINSON, Fellow of the Johns Hopkins University, 1916-1917. John Hopkins Press. 1917. pp. IX. 110. \$1.50.

This interesting and instructive study is part of a larger work which the author hopes some day to publish. About two thousand citations of Scripture have been found in Tennyson's poems, and they "fall so close together as to recall or at least suggest almost the entire contents of the Bible" (p. 1). The book has a distinct and definite purpose, "to discover from Tennyson's use of Scripture the successive and orderly stages of his artistic and poetic development" (p. IX). Six stages or periods are noted: "The Period of Simplicity; the Period of Combination; the Allegorical Period; the Satirical Period; the Dramatic Period; and the Period of Disuse" (p. 11). To each of them a chapter is devoted. These stages are believed to reflect the fluctuations of the poet's faith. "He seems never to have had that robust and enduring faith which enabled Browning to throw himself into the heart of a biblical character or situation. . . . Browning handled Scripture in substantially the same fashion throughout his life, largely because his attitude toward it never seriously changed. The fluctuations of Tennyson's faith, on the other hand seem to have played a large part in dividing his artistic use of Scripture into the stages of phases discriminated in this study" (p. 64).

An interesting contrast is drawn between Shakespeare and Tennyson in their treatment of Scripture. "A complete examination of Shakespeare's dramas yields the conclusion that his rhetorical and literary power with Scripture is exercised upon isolated passages as distin-

guished from Tennyson's artistic blending of many passages. Throughout his career Shakespeare's method was essentially the same; but Tennyson's was varied because of the stages of development through which it passed. Shakespeare always touched a passage briefly, naturally, and livingly; Tennyson often wrought one out more elaborately and sometimes left upon it the mark of the chisel or the smell of the lamp" (p. 77).

"In Shakespeare, then, the Scripture passages are employed in the interest of manifest destiny, dramatic development, or the verdict of conscience. Taken all together and in their climax the citations give the moral of the play. . . . In contrast to the extended and continuous ethical purposes the use of Scripture in Tennyson's dramas, though far more frequent, is nevertheless incidental and temporary. It is a vehicle for single and local expressions" (p. 84). Of the dramas it is said, "In a word, Tennyson's citations are primarily and mainly the product of artistic talent. In Shakespeare they are the product of conscience" (p. 93).

Valuable tables of Scripture citations are given, and the book furnishes an excellent introduction to the study of its theme.

The style though not remarkable for grace or beauty, is clear and vigorous. The form of the volume is attractive.

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

Princeton.

Faithful Stewardship and Other Sermons. By FATHER STANTON. Edited by E. F. Russell, M.A. (S. Alban's, Holborn). Second Edition. George H. Doran Co., 1917. Pp. VI. 1883. \$1.35 net.

The preface informs us that these sermons, with the exception of the last two, "all belong to the same late period of his life, and were preached in the same place, S. Alban's, Holborn, the church he served without fee, for fifty years." "The shorthand report has been reprinted verbatim, and no attempt has been made to mend or trim any of the passages which Father Stanton would have set right if the report had been submitted to him."

The discourses are short, and aim at immediate effect. There is no apparent attempt or desire to treat of the profounder aspects of the truth, or to impart systematic instruction. The aim is simply to impress a practical lesson of present moment. The style is curiously loose and careless even for extemporaneous speech. It lacks precision as well as polish, and is colloquial in the extreme.

The volume gives us no sermons of the ordinary type, but the simple, unconventional, personal, direct appeals of a man profoundly in earnest to those for whose spiritual welfare he holds himself responsible. Though he belonged to the Ritualistic party, and approves of the Mass, the doctrine of Purgatory, and Confession, yet rites and forms are made subordinate to ethical and spiritual truth; they have no worth in themselves, and are of value only as they bring Christ near and make

him real to the soul. Everywhere Christ is magnified and exalted as the only Lord and Savior, in whose blood alone men may find forgiveness and cleansing from all sin.

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

Princeton.

Point and Power in Preaching. By ELIJAH P. BROWN, D.D. (Ram's Horn Brown). Fleming H. Revell Co. 1917. Pp. 192. \$1 net.

The book contains much good advice, couched in a vivid, vigorous, epigrammatic style. The illustrations are drawn from every day life, are always bright and often amusing. It is easy to see why Dr. Brown was drawn to write "The Real Billy Sunday," for author and subject have much in common. Some of the sayings of the evangelist are found in this volume, though we do not know whether he owes them to Dr. Brown or Dr. Brown to him. The point is clearly and strongly pressed that the most interesting material for sermons is drawn from the Bible. "If we would get more of our preaching from the Bible, and not so much from new books and magazines, the question of how to reach the masses wouldn't make so many men bald" (p. 165).

While the treatment of the theme is interesting throughout and the book is racy reading, this style so intense and pointed is more agreeable, like highly seasoned food, when taken in moderation. Used too freely it palls upon the taste. We crave a little relief, greater sobriety at times. But the volume makes a direct, personal, pungent appeal to the ministry that should turn many a preacher to the more careful and prayerful study of the Word.

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

Princeton.

La Foi du Chrétien pendant la Guerre. Discours par Georges Fulliquet, Ancien Pasteur de l'Eglise Réformée de Lyon, Pasteur de l'Eglise Nationale de Geneve. Geneve, Librairie J. H. Jeheber, 1917. Pp. 234. 3 fr. 50.

While much is said of the sorrows and sacrifices that the war entails, there is no trace of bitterness or hate toward those whom he holds responsible for them. It must be counted one of the signal triumphs of the Christian spirit that this is true of most of the books that come to us from the pulpits beyond the sea. It is affirmed that the sufferings and distresses of men have turned their hearts to God in faith and hope.

The most interesting discourses are the last four, which treat of the story of the Canaanitish woman (Matt. 23. 22 ff.). Throughout the volume we miss the profounder teaching of the Gospel. How does Jesus reconcile us to God? (p. 52). Not by the death of the cross, but simply by teaching us that God is ready to forgive, and persuading us to turn to him for pardon. We crave a clearer vision of the Savior in these days of darkness.

Princeton.

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

The Last Weapon. By THEODORA WILSON WILSON. John C. Winston Co., pp. 188. 25 cents.

This is one of the host of books evoked by the war. Story and allegory are blended to frame an argument in favor of peace. War may never be justified, and the only weapon to which a Christian may ever resort is love. That this is the teaching of the Scripture is not and cannot be shown.

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

Princeton.

Christian Nurture. By HORACE BUSHNELL. New York, Charles Scribner Sons. Cloth 12 mo. pp. 351. Price \$1.50.

It is pathetically true that each generation must write its own books. Very few are the volumes of religious thought or moral precept which long outlive their authors. Not many men of the present day are familiar with this treatise by Doctor Bushnell, which was once so famous. Most of it was composed sixty years ago; and, fifty years ago, it appeared in practically its present form. A real service has been rendered to the Church by issuing this new edition; for this is a book which, for many reasons, deserves to survive. Its chief message is to parents; and, however much one might dissent from some of its teachings, no one could read the discussion without a deepening conviction of the careful religious nurture which parents owe to their children.

The first part of the book deals with the *doctrine* of Christian Nurture, and the second part with the *mode*. In the first part, the main thesis is this, viz.; "That the child is to grow up a Christian, and never know himself as being otherwise." This does not mean that regeneration is unnecessary, but that it is needless to wait until a child has reached mature years before the privileges of a Christian experience can be enjoyed. The writer then shows that such a view necessitates a kind of nurture which is specifically Christian; and he relates the thesis to the truth of the organic unity of the family, and to the doctrine of infant baptism. He then considers the related matter of the church membership of children. In the discussion which immediately follows there appears the effect of the peculiar influences of a by-gone age. Dr. Bushnell was reacting against a certain form of evangelism which appeared to deny the possibility of Christian experience for children, and he went to the other extreme of suggesting that instead of evangelizing the world by missionary activities we should depend only or chiefly upon Christian nurture. This is the substance of the chapter on "the out-populating power of the Christian stock."

In treating of the *Mode* of Christian nurture, Dr. Bushnell emphasizes the importance of early impressions, of care as to the diet of children, of correct tempers in parents, and of lawful family government. Attention is also called to the right observance of the Sabbath and of holidays, to instruction in Christian doctrine, and to the practice

of family prayers. The last subject is treated most practically, and the suggestion is made that it is absolutely essential that the life of the family shall be made to correspond to the spirit of the prayers if the right influence is to be exerted upon the children.

This new edition is made the more valuable by a brief but interesting, prefatory, biographical sketch of Doctor Bushnell, by Professor Williston Walker.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

Princeton.

Thoroughly Furnished. The New Westminster Standard Course For Teacher Training. First Year, Part I. The Pupil. By H. T. J. COLEMAN, B.A., Ph.D. First Year, Part II. The Principles of Teaching. By ROBERT WELLS VEACH, D.D. Paper, 12 mo., pp. 64, 59. Price 15c each.

No department of modern Sabbath School work equals in importance that of Teacher Training. To facilitate this work the different evangelical denominations are offering valuable helps. The Presbyterian Church, through its Board of Publication and Sabbath School work is now offering a New Standard Westminster Course based on the standard recently adopted by the Sunday School Council of the Evangelical Denominations and the International Sunday School Association. The new course provides for three years' study, each year containing forty lessons. The text book for the first year is entitled *Thoroughly Furnished*. It is arranged in four parts, of ten lessons each. Part I, prepared by Dr. Coleman, considers the Pupil, presenting the physical, mental and moral characteristics of each successive period of growth, and the education adapted to the period.

Part II, prepared by Dr. Veach, deals with the Principles of Teaching, discussing successively its moral, its social, its physical and its mental basis; and it further, suggests the methods of presenting truth, and "the challenge of Christ to the teacher."

Part III and IV of this new book are prepared by the Rev. Hugh T. Kerr, D.D., and by Dr. Veach. The former part contains "Ten Lessons on How to Teach the Life of Christ in the Different Grades"; and the latter "Ten Lessons on the Sunday School, an Outline of the Aim, Curriculum, and Organization of the Modern Sunday School."

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

Princeton.

Helpful Prayers for all Occasions. Chicago. Glad Tidings Publishing Co., 24 mo. pp. 189. Price, paper 15c, mloth 25c, leather 35c.

This little hand book contains a selection of prayers, historic, poetical, family, public, and prayers specially adapted to children. It was compiled by the Rev. Hugh T. Kerr, D.D., the Rev. John W. Nicely, D.D., and J. Gilchrist Lawson. It is designed to be helpful both from a devotional standpoint and in suggesting how to give verbal expression to the desires of the heart.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

American Church Monthly, New York, July: HENRY C. STAUNTON, The Form of Ceremonial; ARTHUR W. JENKS, Use and Abuse of Church History, III Fallacies; WILLIAM W. SMITH, Progress of Religious Education in the Second Province. *The Same*, August: SELDEN P. DELANY, Educated Men and the Christian Religion; WILSON E. TANNER, Drink Reform and the Example of Christ; JOHN C. McKIM, Proposed Rubric concerning Reservation. *The Same*, September: BENJAMIN W. WELLS, St. Boniface, the Popes and the Karlings; C. P. A. BURNETT, The Scope or Field of Episcopal Jurisdiction; ARTHUR W. JENKS, Use and Abuse of Church History, IV Constructive History.

American Journal of Theology, Chicago, July: ALFRED E. GARVIE, The Danger of Reaction, Theological and Ethical; GERALD B. SMITH, Christianity and the Spirit of Democracy; BURTON S. EASTON, Pauline Theology and Hellenism; HENRY F. COPE, Fifteen Years of the Religious Education Association; CHARLES S. MACFARLAND, Progress of Federation among the Churches; M. SPRENGLING, Aramaic Papyri of Elephantine in English.

Bibliotheca Sacra, Oberlin, July: DAVID F. ESTES, Contents of the Consciousness of Jesus; EDWARD N. HARRIS, Why Send Missionaries to the Heathen?; BERNARD C. STEINER, The Higher Allegiance; HERBERT W. MAGOUN, A Lacuna in Scholarship (iii); BURNETT T. STAFFORD, Success by Giving; FREDERICK W. PALMER, Superfluous Churches.

Catholic Historical Review, Washington, July: JOHN F. O'HARA, Juan Rodriguez de Fonseca; OWEN B. CORRIGAN, Chronology of the American Hierarchy; CHARLES L. SOUVAY, Rosati's Elevation to See of St. Louis; EDWIN V. O'HARA, Catholic Pioneers of the Oregon Country.

Constructive Quarterly, New York, September: J. K. MOZLEY, The Church and the World; W. L. BEVAN, Dr. Döllinger and the Reunion of the Churches; HERBERT KELLY, The United Church of Canada; HENRY E. JACOBS, The United Lutheran Church in America; RAYMOND CALKINS, The Historical Approach to the Problem of Church Unity; LOUIS BRÉHIER, Origin of the Misunderstanding between The Roman Church and the East; SHAILER MATHEWS, Spiritual Challenge to Democracy; DAVID S. CAIRNS, Christianity and the Science of Religion; ROBERT LAW, St. Paul on Preaching; NICHOLAS GLUBOKOVSKY, W. J. Birbeck and Russian Orthodoxy.

East & West, London, July: W. E. S. HOLLAND, A Conscience Clause in Indian Schools; G. HIBBERT-WARE, An Indian Church; M. R. NELIGAN, Missions and the War; KENNETH J. SAUNDERS, Missionary Opportunity of the Y. M. C. A. in the Camps; COPLAND KING, Prayer-Book Revision in the Mission Field; J. P. MALLESON, The End of the Indo-Chinese Opium Traffic; W. C. B. PURSER, India's Infirmities; J. SINCLAIR STEVENSON, St. Patrick's Missionary Methods.

Expository Times, Edinburgh, August: Notes of Recent Exposi-

tion; H. R. MACKINTOSH, Principal Denney as a Theologian; JAMES MOFFATT, Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews; MOSES GASTER, The Grandson. *The Same*, September: Notes of Recent Exposition; R. H. CHARLES, The Beatitudes; THEODORE H. ROBINSON, Jesus and the Pharisees; HAGAR, A Study in Providence; JAMES MOFFATT, The Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Harvard Theological Review, Cambridge, July: J. LOEWENBERG, Classic and Romantic Trends in Plato; HENRY J. CADBURY, A Possible Case of Lukan Authorship; NANCY E. SCOTT, The Ever Memorable Mr. John Hales; JOHNSTON E. WALTER, Kant's Moral Theology.

Hibbert Journal, Boston, July: JAMES WARD, Personality the Final Aim of Social Eugenics; HELEN BOSANQUET, Reconstruction—of What?; FRANCIS E. WARWICK, The New Religion; JOHN B. CROZIER, Practical Religion; W. R. LETHABY, Towns to Live In; W. R. INGE, Survival and Immortality; CHARLES MERCIER, Sir Oliver Lodge and the Scientific World; L. P. JACKS, The Theory of Survival in the Light of its Context; A. HEYKING, Tolerance from a Russian Point of View; EDWARD JENKS, The Englishman and the Law; H. D. RAWNSLEY, Juvenile Delinquency—The Facts and the Cause; F. H. CUTCLIFFE, The Pulpit and its Opportunities.

International Journal of Ethics, Concord, July: VICTOR S. YARROS, Essential Democracy of Russia; C. DELISLE BURNS, Ideals of Democracy in England; J. S. MACKENKIE, Civic and Moral Education; F. W. STELLA BROWNE, Some Problems of Sex; FREDERICK G. HENKE, A Note on the Relation of Ethics to Progress; LOUIS B. WEHLE, Social Justice and Legal Education; JAMES H. LEUBA, Art and Religion.

Irish Theological Quarterly, Dublin, July: REGINALD BELL, The Use of the Summa of St. Thomas; DAVID BARRY, The Contrition Required in Confession; P. O'NEILL, The Concept of Morality and the Last End in the Teaching of St. Thomas; M. J. O'DONNELL, Quasi-Domicile: the Canon Law at Present.

Jewish Quarterly Review, Philadelphia, July: A. MARMORSTEIN, Solomon Ben Judah and some of his Contemporaries; JULIAN MORGENSTERN, Two Ancient Israelite Agricultural Festivals; D. S. BLONDHEIM, Tentative List of Extant Manuscripts of Rashi's Talmudical Commentaries; M. H. SEGAL, Studies in the Books of Samuel II; JACOB S. LAUTERBACH, Bacher's Traditions and Traditionists in the Schools of Palestine and Babylon.

London Quarterly Review, London, July: STEPHEN GRAHAM, Thoughts on the Russian Revolution; W. T. DAVISON, The Church and the Churches; ARTHUR RUDMAN, Italy and Civilization; FRANK BALLARD, The God of Mr. H. G. Wells; T. H. S. ESCOTT, What the Newspaper Owes to the Magazine; G. G. FINDLAY, The Unity of St. Paul's Teaching; COULSON KERNAHAN, Swinburne and Mr. Gosse; ST. NIHAL SINGH, India's Changing Status in the Empire.

Lutheran Church Review, Philadelphia, July: J. A. W. HAAS, Baccalaureate Sermon, 1917; LEANDER S. KEYSER, The Mistakes of a Lib-

eral Theologian; L. FRANKLIN GRUBER, Documentary Sketch of the Reformation; T. W. KRETSCHMANN, Memorial to William Julius Mann; E. C. COOPER, Jude, the Author of Hebrews—an Inquiry Based on a Textual Study of Hebrews and Jude; CARL B. SCHUCHARD, The Desire for and the Possibility of Union in the Lutheran Church.

Lutheran Quarterly, Gettysburg, July: JOHN WAGNER, Baptism, Article IX of the Augsburg Confession; J. A. CLUTZ, The Marks of Lutheranism—The Right Preaching of the Gospel and the Right Administration of the Sacraments; V. G. A. TRESSLER, Luther's Attitude toward the Scripture; C. B. GOHDES, How Can We Transmit Lutheran Truth to the Coming Generation?; WM. C. HAFFNER, The Social and Economic Forces of Germany (ii); J. A. SINGMASTER, Luther as a Preacher; J. A. SINGMASTER, The Norwegian Lutheran Church in North America.

Methodist Review, New York, July-August: R. J. COOKE, The Church and the Alien; C. G. SHAW, Ibsen's Indignation; J. L. COLE, His First Sermon; A. W. LEONARD, Methodism in Hawaii—an Educational Program; HUBERT PHILLIPS, The Shavian Ethics and Philosophy; EDWIN A. SCHELL, Military Pedagogy; HARRY H. BEATTYS, "Hay Philosophy"; E. W. MILLER, A Neglected Forerunner of Luther; GORHAM B. MUNSON, Socialistic Conception of Morality. *The Same*, September-October: A. H. TUTTLE, Methodism Fifty Years Ago and Now; JAMES MUDGE, Chips from Emerson's Workshop; JAMES M. DIXON, Puritanism and Nationality; C. M. MELDEN, A Modern Exodus; JUNIUS B. REMENSNYDER, What the World Owes to Luther—Results of the Reformation Epitomized; L. H. VINCENT, Concerning a Famous Lecture; GEORGE T. SMART, Some Religious Painters of Siena; OSCAR KUHN, Mental and Spiritual Hygiene; C. E. SCUDDER, The Poet's Interpretation of War; PAUL NIXON, Over the Top.

Methodist Review Quarterly, Nashville, July: ARTHUR W. NAGLAR, Martin Luther; HORACE M. DU BOSE, The Failure of Higher Criticism; A. T. ROBERTSON, Paul and Patriotism; H. C. HOWARD, William Booth and His Army; WILLMOORE KENDALL, Augustine the Theologian; MARION T. PLYLER, David in English Drama; R. O. ARMSTRONG, A Graduate in the School of Christ; THEODORE COPELAND, Job—A Study; SAMUEL G. AYRES, Francis Asbury and his Presbyterian Friends; GEORGE F. MELLEN, Early Methodists and Cherokees; JOHN W. ALLEN, Judas Iscariot Not Lost; EDWIN RIDLEY, Canada and the Empire.

Monist, Chicago, July: WILLIAM B. SMITH, The Electronic Theory of Matter; RALPH B. PERRY, Purpose as Systematic Unity; KING S. LIU, Origin of Taoism; J. M. STILLMAN, Contributions of Paracelsus to Medical Science and Practice; HUGO DU VRIES, Origin of the Mutation Theory.

Moslem World, Concord, July: S. M. ZWEMER, The Call to Prayer; ALPHONSE MINGANA, Transmission of the Koran; A Marriage in Fez; S. M. ZWEMER, Animism in Islam; R. W. CALDWELL, Tanta as a Moslem Center; JAMES HALDANEL, Morocco of Today; H. U. WEITBRECHT, Educational Reforms in Turkey; Ask Jesus Christ—A Moslem Tract;

E. W. THWING, A Chinese Moslem's Perplexity; LADY SYDENHAM, Mohammedan Women in India.

Reformed Church Review, Lancaster, July: WILLIAM J. HINKE, The Protestant Reformation; EDWARD S. BROMER, Religious Benefits of the Reformation; ELMER L. COBLENTZ, The Reformed Faith; ULRICH ZWINGLI, Education of Ingenuous Youth; WILLIAM C. SCHAEFFER, The Reformed Church in the United States; GEORGE S. BUTZ, Humanism in Germany and Its Relation to the Reformation; J. SPANGLER KIEFFER, Ministers and Manners.

Review and Expositor, Louisville, July: JAMES STALKER, Dante; W. R. L. SMITH, Life and Character of the Rev. R. J. Willingham; CHARLES A. STAKELY, Some Points Made Clearer in the Life of Christ; HENRY M. KING, John Eliot and Roger Williams; Neutrality and the Vatican; W. W. EVERTS, The Long Road to Freedom of Worship; L. P. LEAVELL, Just Across the Continental Divide; S. M. PROVENCE, Origin of Matthew's Gospel.

Union Seminary Review, Richmond, July: The Birmingham General Assembly; EDWARD MACK, Homiletical Value of the Old Testament; J. E. WISHART, Christian Science; EUGENE C. CALDWELL, Through Judgment to Glory—A Book Study of Isaiah; EGBERT W. SMITH, The Greatest Present Problem of Home and Foreign Missions.

Yale Review, New Haven, July: MEDILL McCORMICK, The Task Before the Country; CHARLES MERZ, Congress and the War; EMILE CAMMAERTS, Is there a Future for Belgium; CHARLES H. BRENT, Tutoring the Philippines; H. W. MASSINGHAM, Lloyd George and His Government; VIDA D. SCUDDER, The Doubting Pacifist; HENRY S. CANBY, Back to Nature; WILSON FOLLETT, A New View of De Morgan; ALEXANDER PETRUNKEVITCH, The Russian Revolution.

Bilychnis, Roma, Luglio: GIUSEPPE RENSI, La ragione e la guerra; FERUCCIO MUTTINELLI, Giorgio Tyrrell e il programma di "Nova et Vetera"; GIOVANNI PIOLI, La fede e l'immortalità nel "Mors et vita" di Alfredo Loisy; DINO PROVENZAL, Giuoco fatto; WILFREDO MONOD, Non la pace, ma la spada. *The Same*, Agosto: CARLO FORMICHI, Cenni sulle più antiche religioni dell' India; GIOVANNI PIOLI, Morale e Religione nelle opere di Shakespeare; ALFREDO TAGLIALATELA, Interregno immortale; ILLE EGO, Un altro lato del modernismo—La democrazia cristiana in Italia; WILFREDO MONOD, Preghiere nazionali.

Gereformeerde Theologisch Tijdschrift, Nijverdal, Juli: V. HEPP, Voor de dooden gedoopt; H. C. VAN DEN BRINK, Eenheid in onze liturgie? *The Same*, Augustus: D. J. VAN KATWIJK, De Boom des Levens.

Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie, Lausanne, Avril-Juillet: PIERRE DE LABRIOLLE, Culture classique et christianisme; PHILIPPE BRIDEL, L'idéal évangélique dans son application à la vie réelle—(iii) Le chrétien et l'Etat; ARNOLD REYMOND, Le problème du mal et l'apologétique de Gaston Frommel.

Theologische Studiën, XXXV, 2: G. VELLENGA, Eene paragraf uit eene Dogmatiek; J. A. RUST, Godsdiens-philosophie des Christendoms van Carl Stange; J. DE ZWAAN, Litteratuuroverzicht.

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries



1 1012 01446 0283

For use in Library only

For use in Library only

